

EUROPEAN HISTORY: Great Leaders & Landmarks from Early to Modern Times

Volume IV

THE MAKING OF MODERN EUROPE

By

Rev. H. J. Chaytor, M.A.

THE GRESHAM PUBLISHING COMPANY
34 SOUTHAMPTON STREET STRAND LONDON

Prefatory Note

The publishers desire to draw attention of subscribers to the present work to the "Epilogue" which has been added to this, the fourth volume, dealing specially with the events that immediately led up to the Great War. This Epilogue has been contributed by Mr. Walter Murray, who is also responsible for the Appendix "Chronological Conspectus", with which the work is provided. The "War" maps and plan that accompany the Epilogue will be of interest.

September, 1914.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		Page
I. LORD CLIVE, A.D. 1725-1774	- - - - -	1
II. WARREN HASTINGS, A.D. 1732-1818	- - - - -	16
III. ROUSSEAU, A.D. 1712-1778	- - - - -	28
IV. GEORGE WASHINGTON, A.D. 1732-1799	- - - - -	47
V. TALLEYRAND, A.D. 1754-1838	- - - - -	60
VI. NAPOLEON, A.D. 1769-1821	- - - - -	74
VII. NELSON, A.D. 1758-1805	- - - - -	97
VIII. WELLINGTON, A.D. 1769-1852	- - - - -	111
IX. METTERNICH, A.D. 1773-1859	- - - - -	124
X. SIMON BOLIVAR, A.D. 1783-1830	- - - - -	138
XI. ABRAHAM LINCOLN, A.D. 1809-1865	- - - - -	154
XII. BISMARCK, A.D. 1815-1898	- - - - -	169
XIII. GARIBALDI, A.D. 1807-1882	- - - - -	190
EPILOGUE: THE BALANCE OF POWER AND THE GREAT EUROPEAN WAR - - - - -		208 ^a

APPENDICES

CHRONOLOGICAL CONSPECTUS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY	- - - - -	209
THE GREAT MOVEMENTS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY	- - - - -	233
NOTES ON HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY	- - - - -	251
BIBLIOGRAPHY	- - - - -	263
SOME HISTORICAL TALES AND ROMANCES	- - - - -	269

ILLUSTRATIONS

PLATES IN COLOUR

	Page
NAPOLEON AT FONTAINEBLEAU -	<i>Frontispiece</i>
From the painting by Paul Delaroche in the Leipzig Gallery.	
WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL TO THE ARMY - - - -	56
From the painting by Andrew C. Gow, R.A.	
THE OATH OF THE TENNIS COURT, 20th JUNE, 1789 - -	62
From the painting by L. C. A. Couder at Versailles.	
NAPOLEON I AND HIS STAFF - - - - -	90
From the painting by J. L. E. Meissonier in the Wallace Collection, London.	
THE DEATH OF NELSON - - - - -	108
From the painting by A. W. Devis in Greenwich Hospital.	
THE PASSAGE OF THE BIDASSOA BY LORD WELLINGTON, 7th OCT., 1813 - - - - -	118
From the painting by Richard Beavis, R.W.S., in the Sunderland Art Gallery.	
NAPOLEON III AND BISMARCK - - - - -	184
From the painting by Camphausen.	
DRAWING FOR MILITARY SERVICE—MODERN ITALY - -	204
From the painting by F. W. W. Topham, R.I., in the Manchester Whitworth Institute.	

BLACK-AND-WHITE PLATES

	Page
FACSIMILE OF LETTER FROM CLIVE - - - - -	8
ROBERT, LORD CLIVE (by N. Dance) - - - - -	
WARREN HASTINGS (by T. Kettle) - - - - -	20

Illustrations

ix

	Page
OPENING OF THE TRIAL OF WARREN HASTINGS IN WESTMINSTER HALL, LONDON, 12TH FEBRUARY, 1788	24
VOLTAIRE—MONTESQUIEU—BUFFON—DIDEROT	32
FACSIMILE OF LETTER FROM JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU	40
JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU (bust by Houdon)	44
BIBLE WHICH ONCE BELONGED TO WASHINGTON'S MOTHER	48
MOUNT VERNON, VIRGINIA: WASHINGTON'S COUNTRY HOUSE	48
GEORGE WASHINGTON (by G. Stuart)	52
TALLEYRAND (by Gerard)	66
THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA, 1815 (from Miniature by Isabey)	70
NAPOLEON AT VARIOUS PERIODS OF HIS CAREER	76
FRIEDLAND IN 1807 (from painting by Meissonier)	86
HORATIO, LORD NELSON (by L. F. Abbott)	104
ARTHUR WELLESLEY, DUKE OF WELLINGTON (by Sir Thomas Lawrence)	112
WELLINGTON'S NOTE OF THE CAVALRY UNDER HIS COMMAND AT WATERLOO	120
PRINCE METTERNICH (by Sir Thomas Lawrence)	128
SIMON BOLIVAR (Statue at Lima, Peru)	142
ABRAHAM LINCOLN	160
PRESIDENT LINCOLN SIGNING THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION (from painting by F. B. Carpenter)	164
PRINCE BISMARCK (by Lenbach)	176
PROCLAMATION OF WILLIAM I AS GERMAN EMPEROR, VER-SAILLES, 18TH JANUARY, 1871 (from painting by Anton Von Werner)	186
GARIBALDI	194

Illustrations

	Page
MAZZINI—COUNT CAVOUR—VICTOR EMMANUEL II—NAPOLEON III - - - - -	198
BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF FRENCH AND BELGIAN FRONTIERS WITH GERMANY - - - - -	208 ^t

MAPS IN COLOUR

INDIA, 1765—INDIA, 1805 - - - - -	16
UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA (1783) - - - - -	50
EUROPE: TIME OF NAPOLEON (1810) - - - - -	80
EUROPE: AFTER CONGRESS OF VIENNA (1815) - - - - -	-
UNITED STATES: CIVIL WAR (1861—1865) - - - - -	102
GERMANY - - - - -	180
ITALY: SINCE 1815 - - - - -	100
BELGIUM - - - - -	-
FRENCH AND BELGIAN FRONTIERS WITH GERMANY	-
GERMAN AND AUSTRIAN FRONTIERS WITH RUSSIA	-
THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIC - - - - -	-

VOLUME FOUR

CHAPTER I

Lord Clive (A.D. 1725-1774)

At the end of the seventeenth century the whole of India was subject to the Mogul emperor Aurungzebe. The ruling powers were Moslems and the mass of the subjects were Hindus. This vast empire was divided into provinces governed by viceroys or subadars appointed by the crown. The provinces, again, were subdivided into a number of imperial districts and native states, in possession of which their rajahs had been left at the time of their conquest. These districts were governed by nabobs appointed by the crown, who carried on their administration under the supervision of the subadars, the rajahs being left practically independent, subject to the regular payment of tribute. The people in the conquered territories held their lands by feudal tenure from the crown. The landowner, in this sense, was the zamindar, who received rent from the cultivator or ryot. The first companies formed in India held their settlements at Madras, Calcutta and elsewhere as zamindars, and paid rent for them to the nabobs. Obviously an empire constructed upon this system could only be held in connection by a strongly centralized authority. It was easy for a provincial governor to make himself independent; in any case he was allowed to maintain a large army in order to enforce his authority throughout the province. The armies, in spite of their size, were totally incapable according to European ideas; discipline there was little or none, and such personal courage as they possessed was conditioned by their superstition and their belief in omens. As long as an officer in command was visible on his elephant the troops were willing to follow him; if he fell, the day was lost. There was no sense of public spirit or patriotism, facts which are sufficient to explain the ease with which small bodies of European troops overcame unwieldy masses of natives. The weakness of the empire had first been exposed by the Mahrattas, who constantly harried the rich plains of the Deccan even during the lifetime of the Emperor Aurungzebe. Eventually they became, as mercenary troops, the terror of the empire, continually changing sides as one

European History

prince was able to outbid another in competition for their services, which, however, often proved as dangerous to their friends as to their foes. Their strength consisted in their well-trained cavalry and their extraordinary mobility.

Aurungzebe died in 1707, and a period of anarchy succeeded. The provincial governors became practically independent and the central authority was barely recognized. Similarly the subdivisions of the provinces attempted to break away from the subadars. Nabobs and subadars alike appointed their successors without consulting the wishes of the puppet emperor, and the natural result was a series of constant disputes concerning the succession to various thrones, which, again, led to local wars involving the natives and the French and English trading companies. At one time, indeed, it was difficult to find any part of the peninsula where a soldier of fortune could not have discovered some opportunity for the exercise of his talents and his sword.

The English had established a factory at Surat early in the seventeenth century, and in 1639 they acquired Madras from the local rajah upon a zamindar tenancy. French, Dutch, and Portuguese settlements were founded upon similar terms. The business of the company in Madras was transacted by a governor and a council who controlled the merchants and writers in the company's service. The pay of these latter was miserably small, but under certain conditions they might engage in trade upon their own account, and some of them thereby were enabled to make considerable fortunes. The companies had but few European and native soldiers capable of bearing arms, and the usual policy in times of danger was to buy off the aggressor and as far as possible to abstain from any interference in native affairs. The French India Company began its career in 1668. Pondicherry was founded in 1674 by one Martin, a man of unusual capacity, who succeeded in establishing excellent relations with the native powers. In 1735 M. Dumas became governor-general of the French possessions in India and abandoned the traditional policy of the foreign settlers, allying himself with the native princes and interfering in their wars, a policy pushed to far greater lengths by his successor, the famous Dupleix. Dumas formed a sepoy army, and at the outset was better supported with men and money from home than were the English settlements. This advantage, however, was not lasting. When the war broke out the French Government starved their company, while the English company was usually well supplied with money.

Upon the outbreak of war between France and Britain in 1744 the European companies were naturally involved. The French were anxious that the European war should not extend to their Indian settlement, and had sent instructions to Dupleix urging him to avoid hostilities. But the governor of Madras was informed that he might expect large reinforcements, which were to be used for the destruction of the French settlement and the annexation of their territory. Dupleix appealed to the nabob of the Carnatic, who was anxious to secure the

Lord Clive

neutrality of the two powers. However, the arrival of the British squadron opened hostilities by sea. The French attacked and captured Madras, and also defeated the forces of the nabob, who had thought that the town would be transferred to him. The fleet and the army which arrived under Admiral Boscawen in 1748 retorted by laying siege to the French settlement at Pondicherry, an enterprise which proved unsuccessful. At the end of that year news was received that France and England had signed the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. The captured territories were returned to their respective companies, and England re-entered upon possession of Madras in 1749. The latter years of this struggle had provided Clive with much military experience and food for reflection.

Robert Clive was born on 29 September, 1729, his father being a country gentleman of small estate, and also connected with the law. His school career is chiefly remarkable for various escapades, which seem to have made him notorious at Market Drayton, where much of his education was gained. His father had no appreciation of his son's capacity, although in later life he was extremely elated by his success. At first the prospect before Clive was the profession of the law with a seat in his father's office, a future which he regarded with extreme distaste. The whole of his school career had shown that his desire was for a life of action. His father had some interest in the East India Company and secured him a writership. He left England in 1743, but the ship was delayed for nine months in the Brazils and did not reach Madras until the close of 1744. The young man's funds had been exhausted, and he had been forced to borrow from the captain at a heavy rate of interest. The friends to whom he had letters of introduction had gone, and he found himself condemned to the same kind of drudgery from which he had sought escape in England, with the difference that the life of dull routine upon which he now entered was conducted under a tropical sun, was poorly paid, and showed little prospect of advancement. In a fit of despair he is said to have attempted suicide, and twice to have snapped a pistol at his head. On both occasions it missed fire, and a companion who entered the room shortly afterwards attempted to fire it at Clive's request. The charge at once exploded, and Clive exclaimed: "I feel that I am reserved for something; I have twice snapped that pistol at my head." The turning-point in his career came with the disgraceful surrender of Madras to the French. Clive fled to Fort St. David, on the same coast, which was still held by England. The French made three fruitless attempts to capture the place between 1746 and 1747. He came to the conclusion that a military life would be far more congenial to him than life as a civilian, and obtained a commission as ensign during the siege of Pondicherry. He showed much of that dauntless courage and resolution for which he afterwards became famous. Upon the cessation of hostilities both France and England had a considerable number of troops in India, and could neither disband them nor maintain them in inaction. For purposes of economy either side used them as

European History

mercenaries in the service of the native princes. Under Major Lawrence, Clive saw some service and came favourably to the notice of his commanding officer. Meanwhile, Dupleix had been steadily advancing the power of France by his skilful use of the jealousies and rivalries of the native powers. He had an admirable instrument for his purpose in the person of Chunda Sahib.

The Carnatic, in which Dupleix was operating, had been one of the latest conquests of Aurungzebe. The first nabob was childless and adopted two nephews as his successors. Upon his death one of these, by name Dost Ali, proclaimed himself nabob without consulting his subadar, Nizam-ul-Mulk, afterwards an important personage in the French and European struggles. The nizam, though he did not interfere with the succession, declined to ratify it, and Dost Ali therefore turned to the French for support. One of his daughters had been married to Chunda Sahib, a man of restless and ambitious temperament, who gained for himself the office of diwan, or financial minister. In 1736 Dost Ali sent Chunda Sahib to seize Trichinopoly upon the death of the ruling rajah. Chunda Sahib remained at Trichinopoly and steadily worked to make himself independent. In 1740, however, the town was captured by the Mahrattas; Dost Ali was killed in battle, and his son purchased a peace from the invaders and agreed to join them in an attack upon Chunda Sahib and Trichinopoly. Chunda Sahib was captured, and the Mahrattas appeared before Pondicherry and demanded the surrender of his wife and family, who had there taken refuge. The French governor, M. Dumas, declined to give them up, and inflicted a severe repulse upon the Mahrattas when they attacked his forts. By this action the prestige of France was greatly advanced; but these rivalries and struggles had roused the attention of the subadar, the nizam, who had hitherto been occupied with intrigues at the imperial court. By 1723 he had made himself practically independent, and as soon as his hands were free he resolved to put an end to the disorder in the Carnatic. He reduced the subordinate princes to his authority, and succeeded in appointing as nabob of the Carnatic a certain Anwar-ud-din, a stranger to the district, whose authority was by no means secure. A number of petty princes and pretenders were awaiting the first opportunity to secure his overthrow, and among these was Chunda Sahib, who was still in confinement.

His opportunity seemed to have arrived in 1748, when the subadar of the Deccan died and a war broke out between his son and grandson for the succession. The grandson applied to the Mahrattas for help, and in the course of his negotiations met Chunda Sahib, who undertook to support him if he were promised the position of nabob of the Carnatic. Dupleix, who regarded this as a good opportunity to interfere, undertook to pay the ransom demanded for Chunda Sahib's release, and to support the enterprise with a force of Europeans and sepoyys. They began by attacking the Carnatic, as Chunda Sahib was there popular, and completely defeated the forces of the nabob. Chunda Sahib was invested with the government, as he had desired,

Lord Clive

and it only remained for him to capture Trichinopoly and secure his possession of the district. The native heir to the throne applied to the English for help, with the result that the French and English forces found themselves ranged upon opposite sides in time of peace. To discuss the justice of the respective cases which they supported would be futile, nor was this a condition which made the smallest appeal to either side. Both the French and English were merely concerned to secure the aggrandizement of their own companies. Dupleix came successfully out of the struggle, gained a large amount of wealth for himself, and became practically ruler of southern India. The English were hard pressed, and were reduced to the possession of Trichinopoly: the loss of this town would imply the irrecoverable loss of the province.

Clive had meanwhile been promoted to the rank of captain as a reward for gallantry shown in the course of the struggle. He succeeded in getting a couple of convoys into Trichinopoly. He found the town in a lamentable situation. The troops were disheartened, the officers unenterprising, there was neither confidence nor energy, and it was clear that the town would fall completely unless a serious effort were made. Clive then developed a plan which has made him famous. Chunda Sahib, in his attempt to capture Trichinopoly, concentrated almost all his available troops round that place and had left the capital of the Carnatic, Arcot, practically undefended. Clive insisted that the true method of relieving Trichinopoly was to capture Arcot, and succeeded in persuading Saunders, the governor of Fort St. David, to try this plan. Fort St. David and Madras, the two principal places held by the English, could muster only 350 men between them, but the governor resolved to risk 200 of them upon this expedition. Clive had 300 sepoys and three small field pieces. Of his eight officers six had never been under fire. Clive successfully surprised Arcot on 13 August, 1751, captured some surrounding forts, and, after completely overawing the enemy in the district, returned to Arcot to see if he could place the town in some posture of defence. Upon Trichinopoly he had produced the desired effect. Chunda Sahib detached 4000 men from the besieging force, and these, with 150 French soldiers under the command of his son, received orders to recapture Arcot at all costs. Clive had succeeded in getting some 18-pounder guns into the town, but the central fort, upon which he concentrated his efforts, was a difficult place to defend. There was nearly a mile of wall to guard, the ramparts were low and crumbling, the moat was dry and in some places choked with rubbish, while the surrounding houses were everywhere within easy musket shot of the defences. For seven weeks the siege went on, and has been immortalized by the generous offer of the sepoys, who came to Clive when the garrison were reduced to rice, and asked that they should be given only the water in which the rice was boiled, which would be sufficient to sustain their strength. The incident is a proof of the extraordinary confidence and devotion to himself with which Clive was able to inspire the forces under him.

European History

On 25 November the enemy made a final assault, and were repulsed at every point. The elephants, employed as battering-rams for the gates, declined to face the storm of musketry, and spread confusion in the ranks of the assailants. The stormers were received, as they mounted to the assault of the two breaches which they had made, with a murderous fire, and retreated in confusion. On the next morning it was found that the enemy had evacuated the place, leaving their guns and treasure chests behind them. The struggle which virtually decided whether the English or the French should be masters of India was over. Clive secured his hold on the town and his lines of communication, and then returned to Fort St. David to report the result of his campaign.

Meanwhile Dupleix, instead of making a vigorous effort to recapture Arcot, issued instructions that every attempt should be made to reduce Trichinopoly before the English forces could be gathered for its relief. His commander-in-chief, a Scotchman named Law, though a gallant soldier, had no power of initiative. He wasted time, declined to expose his troops, and enabled Clive to clear Chunda Sahib's forces from the neighbourhood of Arcot and to concentrate an army for the relief of Trichinopoly. The command was taken over by Lawrence, who had recently arrived from England, and for whom Clive had a profound respect; and Law was forced to surrender, while Chunda Sahib was killed. The operations of 1752, though extending over a wide area, were unfavourable to the French. In 1753 Clive's health was broken, and he was forced to return to England. A short time previously he had married. The fame of his exploits had preceded him; the directors of the company gave him banquets and compliments, and it was obvious that the king's interests in India had been saved from destruction by his energy and genius. He had brought home a considerable fortune, with which he paid his father's debts, and began to lead an extravagant life, while he also entertained thoughts of entering Parliament. In 1754 he stood for the borough of St. Michael's in Cornwall, and by dint of lavish expenditure secured his return. A petition was brought against him, and he was eventually unseated. The prospect of private life in England, with means considerably reduced, had no attraction for him. He knew that he could easily acquire another fortune in India, and therefore offered his services once more to the company, which readily accepted them. At the same time it should not be thought that self-interest was the only motive that had guided his conduct hitherto, nor did he afterwards cast scruples to the winds, as others did, for the purpose of enriching himself. If his previous success had been due to an inborn capacity for command and a power of correct decision for time and place which has rarely been equalled, it should also be remembered that he had gained his reputation by appropriating discoveries made by the French: that the incompetent and undisciplined troops of India were unable to resist European forces even when the disparity of numbers was enormous, that native troops were capable of submitting to European

Lord Clive

discipline and becoming efficient soldiers, and that Indian forces were rarely able to withstand a straight and vigorous attack. These methods had made Dupleix for a time paramount; but Clive must be given the credit of realizing their importance and turning them to the overthrow of their inventor.

When Clive returned to India there seemed every prospect of war. Europe was preparing for the struggle known as the Seven Years' War, and a breach of the peace between France and England seemed imminent. French and English colonists were already fighting in America, and the directors of the East India Company fully realized the importance of preparation for the coming storm. Clive was appointed to Fort St. David, and was given a commission as lieutenant-general in the king's army. Of one great advantage his enemies had already deprived themselves. Dupleix had been recalled to France in 1754, and treated with the utmost ingratitude by his own countrymen. His successor, Godeheu, was prepared to make any sacrifices to secure peace. The first attack in which Clive took part was made upon a pirate chief whose cruisers had harried English merchantmen. The expedition was successful, and upon its conclusion Clive returned to Fort St. David on 20 June, 1756, on which date took place the tragedy in Calcutta known as the Black Hole. The English settlement upon the Hugli had been unmolested until the year 1756, when Surajah Dowlah came to the throne of Bengal. He was an effeminate, feeble character, spoiled by debauchery from his earliest years, of a petulant and uncertain temper. A quarrel with the English upon a trivial matter roused him to a paroxysm of rage. He seized an outlying factory—where Warren Hastings was beginning his career—and appeared before Calcutta with a large army on 5 June, 1756. Madras and Bombay were far distant, the Dutch and French declined to help, and the governor and his subordinates were panic-stricken, and abandoned the walls of the fort. A certain Mr. Holwell, a member of the council, assumed the defence, which was bravely maintained until the twentieth, when the nabob's forces captured the town. Even then, with a little energy, the garrison might have been brought safely to the ships upon which the commander had taken refuge. But, to their lasting disgrace, no effort was made to save them. The sufferings of the 160 prisoners have not been exaggerated by the pen of Macaulay, whose description is sufficiently well known. Surajah Dowlah does not seem to have ordered their confinement, which was due to the brutality of his soldiers. On the other hand, he showed not the smallest compunction for their sufferings. On 18 August the governor of Madras sent for Clive, who had volunteered for service in Bengal. He was appointed commander-in-chief, with full military and political control of the expedition; but by the time he sailed the authorities of Madras had heard that war between England and France was imminent, and he was ordered to return with all his forces by the following April. The voyage to Calcutta was unusually long and difficult. The violence of the monsoon scattered the ships, and when Clive reached the mouth

of the Hugli he found the refugees from Calcutta in a pitiable condition. For five months they had been crowded upon the ships or living on the shore as best they could, exposed to the tropical heat in a deadly climate, and these trials had been fatal to all but the strongest. On 2 January of the following year Calcutta surrendered to Watson, the naval commander, who took possession of the town and appointed Captain Eyre Coote, a name famous in Indian annals, as governor of the place. Clive declined to recognize the admiral's authority in this matter, and a serious difference of opinion occurred. The jealousies between the troops of the crown and those of the company were a constant source of friction. The governor and council at Calcutta cared nothing for the interests of the company, and did their best to prejudice Watson against Clive, for no other reason than that he came from Madras. Meanwhile the nabob was advancing, and it was supposed that the French from Chandernagore would join him. Clive opened negotiations with Surajah Dowlah, who undertook to restore the property of the company and pay an indemnity, which conditions Clive advised the Bengal Government to accept. However, the nabob received his envoys with insult, and Clive therefore composed his differences with the admiral, borrowed some sailors from him, and resolved to attack the next day. Under cover of a dense fog he penetrated to the nabob's camp. Unfortunately he lost his way, and when the fog lifted the English were in a critical position. However, Clive succeeded in extricating his troops, and so impressed the nabob with his advance that he drew off his forces and signed a treaty promising to restore the property he had seized at Calcutta, and ceding increased privileges to the English.

Clive then attacked and conquered the French settlement at Chandernagore on learning that war had been declared between England and France. The French, under de Bussy, might have joined Surajah Dowlah and attacked Clive in Bengal, or have moved into the Carnatic and forced the English to retreat to the defence of Madras. As a matter of fact, de Bussy did nothing, whereas Clive was resolved that the French should have no further opportunity of interfering in Bengal, and that such atrocities as the Black Hole should henceforward become impossible. The nabob attempted to play a double part; while congratulating Clive upon the victory he had gained, he took into his service the French soldiers who had escaped from Chandernagore. He was, however, surrounded by treacherous friends, and Clive soon discovered that there were several perfectly ready to betray their master. The most venal of the rajah's advisers, and at the same time the most important, was one Meer Jaffier, the commander-in-chief of the army. He came to an understanding with the native financial and administrative authorities and opened negotiations with Clive. They stated their grievances against Surajah Dowlah, and went on to say that he was so universally hated that a revolution would in any case be attempted. If their plan was followed the French might be kept out of Bengal, whereas if they took no part in the movement they would simply

March 24th 1757
Received our little Army consisting of 700 Europeans & 2000 Native
troops & Artillery after the English surrendered Seringapatam to the
French on the 21st of Feb^r the Native Army -
consisted in 1200 and 2000 men & the Native Army was
divided on the back of the Town Seringapatam into 5 and 600 Troops with 4 Drums &
2000 400 and 400 men around Bangalore as we encamped and 200 more
left us as a Prince from the Native Army did not find us -

On the 25th - Arrived to the Native Army at Bangalore -
gentlemen to wait upon him in Bangalore every thing might be sold -
with me - Received Richard but the French having & Dispossess all
what he had & from course we nothing could be expected by
him - Meeting his Lieutenant Mr C. Wilson in the night
time for which purpose I waited to D. Clive for 500 rupees to
divide our expenses which he ready gave me and at 3 o'clock in the
morning our little Army consisting of 600 Europeans &
1200 Native Army advanced us one for their
attack a little before day break we arrived to Bangalore and away
first fire their 200 men then the regiments of native troops which
was 1200 men - 2 hours & 40 minutes of 4 P.M. in length -
we were more than 2 hours in fight & advanced the
place very destroyed by the French - We were obliged to sleep outside

of Bangalore about half an hour & a quarter of a mile off
from the Native Army and Bangalore -

25th March 1757

Robert Clive

(102)

FACSIMILE (REDUCED) OF LETTER FROM CLIVE

The document is holograph, and reports the recovery of Calcutta and the defeat of the Nawab's army
(British Museum)

exchange one set of masters for another. In short, they wished to remove the nabob, in order to prevent their own ruin. The ensuing intrigue required great skill and dexterity for its successful accomplishment, and reflected every discredit upon all the parties concerned. As a go-between they employed one Aminchand, a merchant of Calcutta possessed of great wealth, whose conscience, if he had any vestiges of such a commodity, was rather his accomplice than his guide. When the strings of the whole conspiracy were in his hands this man proceeded to levy blackmail upon the parties to the plot, and threatened to disclose the whole plan unless the reward which he had been promised was considerably increased. Clive therefore caused two treaties to be drawn up, from one of which Aminchand's name was omitted. The false document was shown to him to disarm his suspicions, but Meer Jaffier was informed that it was not to be regarded as binding. By 12 June Clive was ready to act. Surajah Dowlah's suspicions of his general had been aroused; at any moment the French might take the field, and the rainy season, when military action would be impossible, was rapidly approaching. Hence the situation of the conspirators was painfully anxious. Meanwhile Meer Jaffier and other military commanders swore obedience to Surajah Dowlah, and persuaded him that his only hope lay in an immediate attack upon the English. He therefore moved forward to the village of Plassey, which was reached by Clive on the twenty-second of the month, after a fatiguing march through country which had been flooded by the commencing rains. Clive was doubtful, even at the eleventh hour, of the fidelity of Meer Jaffier, and in a previous council of war he actually proposed to remain on the defensive, though, under the influence of advice given by Eyre Coote, he changed his mind. His small army was composed of 1000 Europeans and 2000 sepoys, with ten light field pieces, against the 50,000 soldiers and fifty-three heavy guns which Surajah Dowlah could bring into the field. But the nabob felt that he was surrounded by intrigue and treachery, and had as much reason to fear his own army as that of the enemy. With him was a small force of French, about fifty strong, who served their guns well, and alone offered any serious opposition to Clive's success. Clive had posted his men in a mango grove, and utilized a mudbank and ditch as a rampart. The battle opened with a vigorous cannonade upon his position, which did but little damage, while his own well-served guns wrought havoc among the ranks of the enemy. Clive had resolved to maintain his position and attack the enemy at midnight, when he would be stupefied with sleep and opium; but at noon a cavalry charge was made upon his position, which his guns repulsed with heavy loss, and at three o'clock the main body of Surajah Dowlah's left wing moved towards the English right, while a small French force began to retreat from an advantageous position where they had been posted. Clive concluded that Meer Jaffier had seen fit to act, brought up his artillery, and kept up a steady fire upon the enemy's gunners. He soon saw that the decisive moment had come, and ordered a general advance.

Surajah Dowlah's army broke and fled, deserting vast provisions of baggage, cattle, and military stores. The battle of Plassey was neither furiously contested nor did it provide Clive with any great opportunities to show his generalship. He lost about 70 men, and the enemy some 500 or 600, but few victories have produced more far-reaching results. Plassey began that career of conquest which gave the command of the greatest Mohammedan power in the world to a small island in the west of Europe. The immediate results were also somewhat disappointing. Surajah Dowlah fled to his capital, and attempted to escape thence to Patna. He was discovered in the course of his flight, brought back, and put to death with much indignity and without Clive's knowledge. When Clive and Meer Jaffier proceeded to settle pecuniary obligations they were much disappointed to find that Surajah Dowlah's treasure amounted to about a million and a half instead of the forty millions which they had been led to expect. Aminchand was then informed that the treaty in which his name appeared was a sham, and that he was to have nothing. The sudden shock is said to have reduced him to a state of imbecility from which he never entirely recovered. It was a trick, in any case, which could easily have been avoided, and which has left the deepest stain upon Clive's reputation. At the same time, this is the only instance in which he failed to deal straightforwardly with the natives, who invariably gave him their implicit confidence. Clive himself made some £200,000 out of the transaction. In 1773, when defending himself before the select committee which was enquiring into the charge of peculation, Clive said: "When I recollect entering the nabob's treasury at Moorshedabad, with heaps of gold and silver to the right and left and these crowned with jewels, by God, at this moment I stand astonished at my own moderation". Clive's action may have set a bad example, and did, no doubt, conduce to the appalling rapacity which characterized the behaviour of the English Bengalese officials during the five years when he was himself absent from the country; but at the same time there was neither concealment nor dishonesty in the matter. Everyone knew that he had the money; he broke no rule of the company in accepting it, and the general customs of the time in India permitted such presents.

Clive returned to Calcutta, and was occupied for some time in distributing the money allotted to the people of Calcutta as compensation, settling claims for prize money, and organizing a civil service for the administration of the province. He would have liked to go home, but he felt that he could not leave the country as long as Britain and France were at war. Meer Jaffier, the nabob whom he had set up, was totally incompetent as a ruler; he had a swarm of relatives who were anxious to share the spoils; his troops were furiously demanding their pay, and the British had transported three-quarters of a million sterling from his treasury to Calcutta. He therefore proceeded to recoup himself by plundering the Hindu nobles. The result was a native rising, which Clive was obliged to suppress. Meer Jaffier began to regret his decision to help Clive. He found himself a mere puppet

Lord Clive

in the hands of the British; the money gained by trade and commerce flowed into their pockets instead of his own. Clive fully understood that the British could not now retreat from the position which they occupied without ruin to themselves, and he devoted his energies to maintaining British prestige without wounding native feelings, and throughout the province he was regarded by the native inhabitants with a respect which amounted almost to reverence.

Clive now assumed the governorship of Bengal, and the first problem which engaged his attention was the question of the English position in Madras. After the declaration of war in 1756 the French had sent out an expedition under Count Lally, a keen soldier, but totally inexperienced in Indian warfare. On 2 June, 1758, he succeeded in capturing Fort St. David, to the great indignation of Clive. He then proceeded to besiege Madras; but his native soldiers were unpaid and harshly treated, he had no notion of making allowances for native prejudices and no respect for native customs, and his army melted away. Finally, in 1759, he was obliged to retire in disorder. In 1760 Eyre Coote defeated the French at Wandiwash, and in 1761 Pondicherry was captured. The French attempts ended in total failure. During this period Clive had been able to send troops to create a diversion in the Deccan under Colonel Forde, who stormed Masulipatam, one of the most daring feats of arms in the whole of the war. Clive himself was left with only 280 Europeans, and very few stores and ammunition to maintain the prestige of his nation in Bengal.


In 1759 the safety of the province seemed likely to be endangered by troubles which originated in Delhi. The reigning emperor and his family were mere figureheads, and were practically prisoners in the hands of the grand vizier. From this confinement his eldest son, known as the shahzada, contrived to escape, and, giving himself out as the subadar of Bengal and Behar, he collected an army of military adventurers and prepared to invade the country. Meer Jaffier doubted the fidelity of his troops and his own capacity to avert the invasion, and therefore applied for help to Clive. Clive himself had sent all available troops with Forde, but he did not hesitate to assure Meer Jaffier that he would protect him with a military force. Early in 1759 he started with 400 Europeans and 2500 sepoys. Meanwhile the shahzada's force had risen to 40,000 men; but such was the terror of Clive's name that upon his approach the army melted away, and the prince threw himself upon the generosity of Clive. Clive declined to assist him, and told him he must shift for himself, a policy which was highly approved at Delhi, where the vizier invited Clive to establish a factory. Meer Jaffier granted him the rent which the company paid for the lands in their tenancy near Calcutta, amounting to thirty thousand a year. But this unscrupulous ruler, anxious by any means to overthrow Clive's power, made secret overtures to the Dutch, and invited them to bring a force into Bengal and form a settlement in opposition to the British. The Dutch readily accepted the invitation; their commerce had been seriously impaired by the progress of the English, and in 1759 they

fitted out an expedition and anchored at the mouth of the Hugli. Clive did not attempt to discuss the legality of action against a nation with whom Britain was presumably at peace. He attacked and completely defeated the Dutch advance force, and obliged them to sign a treaty disavowing the proceedings of their commanders, acknowledging themselves the aggressors, and agreeing to pay damages. The commissioners in Europe, who afterwards investigated his conduct, could find no grounds for criticism, and both the company and the Government approved his action.

Clive now felt that he could return to England, and believed that he could serve the interests of his company better at home than in Bengal. He was anxious to enter Parliament, and hoped to secure a sufficient following to enable him to influence the course of Indian policy at home. In 1760 he sailed for England. Four years previously, when he landed in Calcutta, the English occupation of the country here was represented by a few miserable fugitives hiding in hovels on the shore or tossing with fever upon their ships. Clive and his nation were now regarded as the paramount power in India. The merchants of the company were literally coining money, the ruined settlement of Calcutta was rising into magnificence, and every foreign rival had been driven out of the country. The credit of this success was entirely due to Clive, and he had the further satisfaction of knowing that not only had he given an empire to the company, but that he was himself one of the richest of English subjects.

On reaching England, Clive was unfortunately confined to his bed and in danger of losing his life by a severe illness which lasted for nearly twelve months. By dint of large expenditure he secured a seat in the House of Commons and a number of followers who voted with him. He was anxious to provide some reorganization which would prevent the constantly rising friction between the king's officers and the servants of the company. He seems to have come to the conclusion that the court of directors in England were incompetent, and that the crown should take over the sovereignty of Bengal. At that time nearly a year was expended in transporting letters to India and getting an answer, while many of the directors owed their positions merely to their controlling interests in the company's shares and not to any knowledge of Indian affairs or business capacity. They were, moreover, totally incompetent to deal with the new situation. As in times before Clive had entered upon the scene, they were chiefly concerned to extend their commercial profits and to avoid any interference with political disputes in India. Clive's success had naturally produced a division of counsels. Some members were delighted with it, others feared the possibility of complications with the emperor, while others wished to cut down the profits of the agents in general and of Clive in particular. The contradictory orders which they issued made Indian administration impossible except by such men as were willing to run the risk of disregarding them entirely.

Clive came into collision with the company upon the question of



ROBERT, LORD CLIVE

From the painting by N. Dance, R.A., in the National Portrait Gallery, London

the Calcutta rent which had been assigned to him by Meer Jaffier. This the directors proposed to confiscate, an entirely illegal action. They could have restored it to Meer Jaffier, but, having signified their approval by acquiescing in the payment of it to Clive for the period of four years, they could not possibly appropriate it themselves. But before the question came up for trial the court of directors were obliged to make a complete surrender to Clive. During his absence Bengal had fallen into a state of anarchy, and the company concluded that Clive was the only man who could save them from total ruin. The new governor of Bengal had quarrelled with Meer Jaffier, and was threatened by the central power. The right of private trade had been shamefully abused by the company's servants, who acquired almost a monopoly of Bengalese trade in certain articles, and amassed large fortunes for themselves at the company's expense and that of the population. The governor had no following in the council, and was powerless. At that moment Meer Jaffier died, and a quarrel about the appointment of his successor was the sequel. Clive's resolution to return to India was dictated by purely patriotic motives. "Do you think", he writes after reaching Calcutta, "that history can show an instance of a man with £40,000 per annum, a wife, family, and relations in abundance, abandoning his native country and all the blessings of life to take charge of a government so corrupt, so lost to all principles and sense of honour, as this is?" He reached Madras in April, 1765, and resolved to place Meer Jaffier's grandson, a child of six, on the throne, and to rule in his name under the authority of the emperor. When he reached Calcutta he heard that Meer Jaffier's son had secured the vacant place by bribery, and loudly expressed his indignation. He found the civil service in an appalling state of corruption, and the army mutinous and insubordinate; indeed many of the Europeans had actually deserted to the native powers.

Clive immediately proceeded to act with the greatest vigour and determination. Private trading was forbidden, and salaries were raised by distributing among the senior civil servants the profits of the salt monopoly. Some members of the council resigned, to escape subjection to an enquiry, others were removed, and anyone who ventured to oppose Clive's projects of reform was summarily dismissed. The officers of the army objected to the reduction of their pay by the discontinuance of an indulgence originally granted after the battle of Plassey, and formed a conspiracy to mutiny. Clive arrested the more prominent offenders and sent them to England, promoted deserving non-commissioned officers, and secured others from Madras. In short, he spared no efforts to cleanse what he called the Augean stable. He reduced working expenses, paid off the debts of the company, abolished the opportunities for illicit profits and speculation, reformed the civil service, reorganized the army, made advantageous treaties for the company, and secured the whole political power of Bengal to the English administration. This he accomplished in the short space of twenty months, in the teeth of the strongest opposition. Great as his military

European History

services had been, possibly even greater was the ultimate benefit which he conferred by these reforms, which put an end to five years of the most shocking misrule, which must ever remain a disgraceful stain upon the annals of English administration in India.

When he returned to England, in 1767, he found, as he probably expected, that his vigorous action had roused a host of enemies against him. He had trampled upon the strongest of human motives—the love of power and of reputation—and those whom he had dismissed or had forced to resign spent their ill-gotten gains in the purchase of Indian stocks in order to avenge themselves upon the man who had put an end to their embezzlements. Clive had returned with health entirely shattered by the climate and by his exertions, and in no mood for undergoing the continual annoyance either of malignant attacks or of a serious enquiry. In fact, the mental and bodily fatigue which he had incurred during the latter years of his stay in India undoubtedly cut short his life. In 1772 Parliament was unable to neglect Indian affairs, while Clive's enemies were anxious to make his conduct the subject of public attack. One Mr. Sulivan, a leading member of the directors, brought in a bill "for the better organization of the affairs of the East India Company and of their servants in India, and for the due administration of justice in Bengal". The bill was made an excuse for a series of attacks upon Clive, who defended himself in a powerful speech, which Chatham declared to be one of the finest pieces of eloquence he had heard in the House of Commons. Leave was given to introduce the bill, and a committee of enquiry was appointed, which was obviously directed against Clive. In 1773 definite charges of peculation were made against him, and he was accused of embezzling various sums to the extent of nearly £240,000. Clive made a long speech, and vigorously attacked the directors and the malignity of his enemies. The motion of censure was rejected without a division, and he left the enquiry to enjoy his wealth and honours undisturbed. After his return from India in 1760 he had received an Irish peerage, and he had been recently appointed lord-lieutenant of two counties and installed as a Knight of the Bath. He was still in the prime of life, but he had suffered throughout his career from constant fits of depression; and when the excitement of the Parliamentary enquiry was over these attacks returned upon him with redoubled force. In a fit of depression and physical suffering he committed suicide on 22 November, 1774, when he was just forty-nine years of age.


Few men have accomplished so much in so short a time, and few have combined so conspicuously military talents and administrative capacity. He had a marked power of statesmanship, not only in recognizing the facts of a case, but also in selecting the most capable instruments for carrying out his own purposes. Few men, also, have had to deal with more difficult situations. He went to India as a servant of a company which was occupied purely by commercial considerations; he involved the company in political difficulties which it was at first anxious to avoid, and burdened it with the administration

of an empire as large and complicated as any in Europe. His policy was to govern India through the natives and to use existing native machinery as far as it could be utilized in the British interests. The British were not to interfere with native administration or maladministration of justice, but were merely to exercise a general supervision. Conquests were not to be extended beyond Bengal, for the cost of conquest was ruinous. Though the opportunity was offered him of extending British interests by throwing his weight and his influence into the scale when successions were in dispute, he resolutely declined. He considered, and with perfect correctness, that the British had better consolidate what they already had, and gain experience by advancing cautiously. If Clive at times committed errors he was constantly animated by a strong sense of duty and patriotism; even in the most questionable transaction of his life, the fictitious treaty by which Aminchand was deceived, he made no attempt to suppress the record of the facts in the minutes of the committee. Though in constant physical suffering, which could only be alleviated by opium, he has never been charged with a single act of cruelty or of any injustice that could be substantiated for a moment. Few men have been obliged to give so scrupulous and exacting an account of their lives, and few men have come out of the ordeal with less damage to their credit.

CHAPTER II

Warren Hastings (A.D. 1732-1818)

Warren Hastings was born in 1732, on the borders of Worcestershire and Oxfordshire, of an old family long connected with the manor of Daylesford. The family fortunes had sunk into decay, and Hastings was left an orphan at an early age. Westminster School still proudly points to his name in the list of King's Scholars, which he headed for his year. He showed first-rate ability, and when his guardian removed him from the school in 1749, to receive some instruction in bookkeeping before taking a writership in the East India Company, the headmaster entered a vigorous but unavailing protest at the loss of his most promising pupil. Hastings reached India just before Clive had made his name famous, and for two years laboured at Calcutta, keeping ledgers and supervising the warehousing of goods, while Clive was defeating the French and their native allies in the Carnatic. He was then sent up to Moorshedabad, where the company had established a small factory, shortly before the accession of Surajah Dowlah and his declaration of war against the English. Hastings was kept a prisoner upon the spot while the nabob marched upon Calcutta, and the tragedy of the Black Hole took place. During the interval between these events and the battle of Plassey, Hastings supplied the authorities with such information concerning the doings of the nabob as he could gain. He was involved in the conspiracy which ended in the overthrow of Surajah Dowlah, but fear of detection obliged him to retreat upon the Ganges. At this time he married the widow of a certain Captain Campbell, who died in 1759. Their child survived her but a few years. When the Madras expedition under Clive appeared on the Hugli, Hastings shouldered a musket and entered the ranks. Clive was well aware of his high administrative capacities, and after the battle of Plassey, when Meer Jaffier was appointed nabob of Bengal, Hastings became the company's agent at the new court. During the interval between Clive's first and second administration Hastings became a member of the Calcutta council under the governorship of Vansittart, a feeble and inefficient ruler who was incapable of restraining the rapacity of his subordinates, and whose administration was the most disgraceful period in the history of the East India Company. The vast system of smuggling carried on under various legal fictions enabled the youngest writer in the company to enrich himself almost as he pleased. The Bengalese were terrorized by the exactions of the



English, and the sight of the company's flag was enough to send them flying in terror from their villages. If Hastings could not protect the natives, at any rate he refrained from plundering them, and is the only character who comes with credit out of a period of peculation and extortion. In 1764 he returned to England, and the very moderate fortune that he brought with him is sufficient evidence that he had not abused his trust.

His liberality to his relatives and an unfortunate speculation in Bengal soon reduced his gains to nothing. Little is known of his life in England for the next four years. He was introduced to Dr. Johnson and began writing prose and verse upon various political subjects. But his literary bent was by no means suited to the tastes of the age. Hastings might have been a great historian: he could never have been a poet. During his first winter at home he applied to the directors for further employment in India, but in vain. However, in 1768 the company required a trustworthy adviser to extricate the finances of Madras from the confusion into which they had fallen, and Hastings was given a seat in the Madras council. In the course of the voyage he fell in love with a married lady whose husband, a German, baron Imhoff, was on his way to seek his fortune at Madras. The baron and his wife had nothing in common; Hastings and the baroness had everything in common. The natural result was a divorce and the marriage of the future administrator with the baroness. At Madras, Hastings found the finances of the company in a greatly involved condition. Though politics attracted him rather than finance, he devoted his energies to the raising of dividend, and with such success that the directors placed him at the head of the government of Bengal. In 1772 he therefore moved to Calcutta. He owed his appointment, in part at least, to the influence of Clive, who wrote to him urging him "to place public interests above all private claims, to trust his own judgment, to spend carefully and to act vigorously in time of danger", advice which after-events showed to have been somewhat superfluous. But he had taken a heavy burden upon his shoulders. His instructions were to call the company's servants to account, to punish those offenders against whom illegal actions could be proved, to abolish the monopolies that were destroying the inland trade, to advise cheaper and securer means of collecting the revenue, and to reorganize the court of the nabob. He was president of the council. On the other hand, every member had an equal vote with him, while some of the members were guilty of the very misdemeanours which he had been specially instructed to punish.

Hitherto the internal government of the two provinces known as Bengal had been in the hands of a native deputy-governor who decided all administrative matters, while the company theoretically devoted its energies to trade. At the same time the deputy governors were supported in office by the power of the English behind them, and the important personage in Bengal was a certain Mohammed Raza Khan, a Mussulman noble who had hitherto enjoyed the confidence

European History

of the directors. The directors, however, observing that the divorce between the executive power and the company was a source of many evils, resolved to take the government of the country into their own hands. Hastings was ordered to remove Raza Khan from office, and to bring him to trial at Calcutta upon various charges of embezzlement and oppression. While this event was pending, Hastings introduced certain reforms into the system of government, and reorganized the revenue and the methods of collecting the company's dues. The stipend of the nabob of Bengal was cut down by one-half, and Hastings thus hoped that an improvement might become apparent in the company's dividends. The morality of these proceedings may have been open to question, but the province had been ceded to the company by the Great Mogul, the refusal to continue the tribute or stipend hitherto paid could be justified only by a quibble, and Hastings was not his own master in the matter. The company was quite willing that he should rule with humanity and justice provided that money was sent home in sufficient quantities; the latter condition was indispensable.

The fall of Raza Khan was regarded as a great opportunity by one Nuncomar, or Nanda Kumar, who had been governor of Hugli under Surajah Dowlah until 1762. Hastings had then helped to convict him of plotting against the company and had earned his irreconcilable enmity. Treachery and forgery were charges fully substantiated in his case and were well known to the court of directors, but he was supposed to possess influence sufficiently powerful to inflict severe damage upon the company should he be so minded, and the directors ordered Hastings to make what use he could of him, especially in the prosecution of Raza Khan, a task entirely to Nuncomar's taste. The trial, however, ended in an acquittal, with the result that Hastings became the object of the most vindictive hatred on the part of Nuncomar, who began to see that he had only been used as a tool while the government was transferred from native to European hands. The nature of Hastings's reorganization during this period is enough to stamp him as a statesman of the highest order. The trade of the country had been steadily stimulated; a bank had been opened in Calcutta; the company's dividends were beginning to rise; the work of the council was accomplished with less friction than ever before, under the system of committees which Hastings introduced. But disorder seemed to be threatening upon the frontiers of Bengal.

A rich tract of land along the base of the Himalayas, running eastward from the Ganges to the borders of Oudh, was occupied by a loose confederacy of Afghan chiefs, the Rohillas. They were oppressed by the Mahrattas in conjunction with the emperor of Delhi, and turned to the vizier of Oudh for aid. He again applied to the British for help. The Mahrattas would certainly occupy Oudh if they were allowed to establish themselves in Rohilla territory, and would in that case threaten the British. Thus Oudh and the British joined to support the Rohillas, and the Mahrattas were driven back.


Warren Hastings

Such was the state of affairs in this quarter at the outset of 1773, when Hastings had been in office about a year. He was in an extremely difficult situation. The company's credit was at a low ebb, money was urgently needed for reforms and for defence, and in the course of 1773 Hastings held a conference with the vizier of Oudh concerning the defence of his province, which was an important bulwark to the British settlements. The vizier mooted the advisability of expelling the Rohilla chiefs from their territory and annexing it to his own. He complained that the Rohillas had failed to keep their engagements with him, and that a possible agreement between them and the Mahrattas would expose him to serious danger. He therefore proposed a joint expedition, to which Hastings agreed on condition that the vizier should find the money. Eventually forty lakhs of rupees in payment of the English military expenses was offered, in return for which Hastings agreed to send a brigade for the reduction of the Rohillas. The proposal was approved by the council upon grounds of political expediency, but Hastings was quite aware that the enterprise would be sharply criticized elsewhere; and, as a matter of fact, no part of his administration has been the object of fiercer condemnation than his share in the Rohilla war. Macaulay has drawn a picture of 100,000 people fleeing to pestilential jungles from the tyranny of a despot to whom their substance and their blood and the honour of their wives and daughters had been sold by the British. The historian Mill, with a greater show of impartiality, condemned the whole business in terms hardly less severe, and there is no doubt that the native troops plundered in the usual native style, to the indignation of the British commander, who was no less disgusted by their cowardice in the field. Hastings does not seem to have foreseen that he had made himself responsible for the horrors of Asiatic warfare by taking a share in the profits of the expedition while resigning any control over the management of it. It was undoubtedly an act of unprovoked invasion, and it was the last occasion upon which British troops were employed by native allies without themselves directing the conduct of operations. The only thing that can be said is that the Rohilla chieftains were rather worse scoundrels than their native opponents. They were a gang of military adventurers paying nominal allegiance to the Mogul for the province they had seized. The allegations that the country was widely ravaged were unfounded, and little more was done than to deport the families of the chieftains and to banish those who were found bearing arms. If Hastings had made no bigger profit out of the affair for the company, the border policy which dictated this move might have passed muster. From a financial point of view the result was entirely successful. He had added a huge sum of ready money to the company's finances, and had vastly raised the annual income.

Meanwhile, in 1773, the Regulating Act had been passed which changed the constitution of the East India Company at home. The presidency of Bengal was now to control the other possessions of the

company, and the chief of the presidency was to be governor-general, a title which thus devolved upon Hastings. He was to be assisted by four councillors, one of whom was in India, while the other three were sent out from England. Of these latter, one has become famous, Philip Francis. Hastings's war with these three began from the time Francis put his feet upon Indian soil, and continued until two of them had died and the third had gone home. Francis enjoys notoriety at the present day as one of the reputed authors of the *Letters of Junius*. He was a man of malignant nature, conceited and arrogant, combative and crafty, and, according to Macaulay's well-known description: "Prone to malevolence and prone to the error of mistaking his malevolence for public virtue, merciless as is a man who, under a strong delusion, confounds his antipathies with his duties". There landed in Madras at the same time an old schoolfellow of Hastings, Sir Elijah Impey, who came out to India as chief justice.

Hastings had one supporter in the council, Barwell, but the other new arrivals, Clavering, Monson, and Francis, possessed a majority of votes, and proceeded to interfere in the arrangements which Hastings had made, with the rashness and indiscretion of complete incompetency. In every direction they reversed and countermanded the policy of the governor-general, threw the affairs of Bombay into disorder, interfered with the domestic disputes of the Mahrattas, and attempted to reform the judicial system of Bengal with such effect that robbery and murder became common in the very suburbs of Calcutta. The natural impression left upon the native mind was the conclusion that Hastings was a fallen man, and every native who wished to curry favour with the prominent party in the council proceeded to furnish them with constant accusations. These were taken seriously by Francis and his two followers, who were apparently not aware that in Bengal full evidence of an accusation for murder, including the corpse, could be procured for an insignificant monetary payment. Of these accusers the foremost was Nuncomar, who deemed that the time had come for his revenge against Hastings. He brought various charges forward; in particular he accused Hastings of procuring the acquittal of Raza Khan in return for a large sum of money. Hastings declined to hear the charge or to lower his dignity by meeting a native accuser. His opponents therefore believed that they were all-powerful, and that his overthrow was imminent; Nuncomar himself walked in triumph amid obsequious crowds of his countrymen, when he was suddenly arrested and thrown into jail. The judicial authority in Bengal was entirely independent of the council, and, thanks to Impey, was entirely under the influence of Hastings, who at once prosecuted Nuncomar and others upon a charge of conspiracy, and, a short time afterwards, upon a further charge of forging and uttering a bond. At the same time the documents which he had brought forward as proof of Hastings's dishonesty were discovered to be forgeries, and, as everybody knows, the business ended in Nuncomar's execution. The severity of this punishment amounted to injustice; but Nuncomar



{107}

Warren Hastings.

WARREN HASTINGS

From the painting by T. Kettle in the National Portrait Gallery, London

must have realized that he had been playing with edged tools, and he had been beaten with his own weapons. At any rate the lesson was effectual so far as the natives were concerned. The most powerful and influential of Hindus, who had ventured to attack a great member of the council, was hanged in broad day with every circumstance of ignominy before thousands of his countrymen. The informers who had sought to curry favour with the council by blackening the character of Hastings were silenced immediately and for ever, and all parties realized that the governor-general was a most dangerous adversary to provoke. That the prosecution was the result of something like conspiracy between Impey and Hastings there is little moral reason to doubt; on the other hand, no solid proof for such an assertion has ever been forthcoming, nor is it likely that any would be found, in view of the infinite patience, the tenacity and fertility of resource, and the diplomatic dexterity which Hastings invariably displayed.

Meanwhile the directors in London had been informed of the Rohilla war and of the disputes between Hastings and his colleagues. In 1775 Hastings had announced to his friends that if his policy with regard to the Rohillas and Oudh were condemned at headquarters he would at once resign. The Regulating Act, which had secured his appointment as governor-general, enabled the crown to remove him from office on receipt of an address from the company, and such an address Lord North was anxious to procure. Clavering and Francis were equally anxious to succeed Hastings in office, and gathered a large party in the East India House pledged to bring about his recall. When the proprietors rejected the proposal by a large majority, his agent in London produced the resignation of twelve months before, and suggested by way of compromise that he should be allowed to retire under a complete indemnity. The directors accepted the proposal, and appointed Wheler, one of themselves, to succeed Hastings, while Clavering was to hold office until Wheler should arrive. Meanwhile Monson had died, and the remaining four members of the council were equally divided; but as Hastings possessed a casting vote under the constitution he was able to govern precisely as he pleased. He was therefore the less disposed to resign his office, and asserted that he had never given any instructions which could warrant his agent's action, and that if twelve months previously he had declared his intention to resign, he had since repeatedly contradicted it. In the ensuing quarrel the East India Company supported Hastings, being well aware that he was the best man at their disposal in a time of crisis. The French had just declared war, the great quarrel with the United States of America had broken out, and Britain at home was fully occupied with the struggle for existence. In 1778 Hastings was stranded in India and could expect no support from home. He was well aware of the danger to the west coast if the French fleet should be sent to act in concert with the turbulent Mahrattas, and he therefore made preparations for attacking them when he received news that war had been proclaimed in London

European History

and Paris. The authorities sent him, as military commander, Sir Eyre Coote, who had distinguished himself under Clive, and who was still the most capable commander for the purpose of Indian warfare though he had lost the freshness and vigour of his youth. Hastings was able to work in harmony with this somewhat capricious and irritable character, and never was harmony more required. In the first place Bengal itself was exasperated by Impey's methods of judicial procedure. Natives who failed to pay their taxes were prosecuted according to forms of law, which, however customary in England, were simply contumelious in India. Hastings was obliged to interfere, and overcame the difficulty of Impey's judicial independence by making him a judge in the service of the company, which he accepted in consideration of a largely increased salary. Then came the quarrel with Hyder Ali, a Mohammedan soldier, who had gradually built up for himself the kingdom of Mysore, and become one of the most formidable enemies with whom the British army in India has ever had to contend. At the news of the breach with France the English attacked the French settlements in India, and seized among them a small French fortress on the coast, though Hyder Ali had warned them that it was under his special protection. He therefore supported the French cause, and in 1780 fell upon the Carnatic with a great and irresistible army, guided by many French officers, and wasted the country far and wide. The famous picture drawn by the fertile imagination of Burke is not entirely imaginary.

Then ensued a scene of woe, the like of which no eye had seen, no heart conceived, and which no tongue can adequately tell. All the horrors of war before known or heard of were mercy to that new havoc. A storm of universal fire blasted every field, consumed every house, destroyed every temple. The miserable inhabitants flying from their flaming villages were in part slaughtered; others, without regard to sex, to age, to the respect of rank or sacredness of function, fathers torn from children, husbands from wives, enveloped in a whirlwind of cavalry, and amidst the goading spears of drivers and the trampling of pursuing horses, were swept into captivity in an unknown and hostile land. Those who were able to evade this tempest fled to the walled cities. But escaping from fire, sword, and exile, they fell into the jaws of famine. For months together, these creatures of sufferance, whose very excess and luxury in their most plenteous days had fallen short of the allowance of our austerest fasts—silent, patient, resigned, without sedition or disturbance, almost without complaint, perished by a hundred a day in the streets of Madras, and expired of famine in the granary of India.

Hastings acted with his usual decision, and sent Sir Eyre Coote to Madras with all the men and money that he could collect. By 1781 Hyder Ali was driven out; but the course of operations had reduced the governor-general to the most severe financial straits. A quarrel with Francis had rid him of this long-standing adversary. The governor-

Warren Hastings


general shot him through the body in a duel, and Francis was obliged to return to England. In the council and in the court he was thus comparatively at peace, but the war had drained the treasury, and it was necessary to find some means of raising further revenue, not an insuperable task for a mind so fertile in expedients as that of Hastings. It was never difficult for him to find some excuse for interfering in the affairs of another state. In nearly every native province the governor, the local nabob, or rajah might be a strong potentate practically independent of the central power; or he might, again, be a man of straw ruling upon sufferance. In either case his title could be called in question, and thus Hastings saw his opportunity in the case of the rajah of Benares. This ruler had acknowledged the English power after the submission of his overlord, the nabob of Oudh, and the annual tribute to which he had agreed had been regularly paid. Upon the outbreak of the war with France, Hastings demanded an increased tribute, and further demands were met with procrastination and excuses. Possibly the rajah was treacherously intriguing with the Mahrattas, as Hastings declared he was. At any rate, upon his refusal to pay, Hastings appeared at Benares in person with a small force and placed the ruler under arrest. A tumult rose, in the course of which the rajah escaped, the little English force was severely handled, and Hastings himself was in much danger. But he succeeded in summoning the English troops and adding the province to the dominions of the company. The treasure, however, which he had expected to find entirely disappointed his expectations. It was therefore necessary to look elsewhere. In September, 1781, the Madras Government wrote: "We know not in what words to describe our distress for money, nor can any conception you can form of it exceed the reality". What was true of Madras was even more true of Bengal. The nabob of Oudh owed large arrears of debt and was unable to pay. He met Hastings to discuss the situation, and pointed out that, though he had no money of his own at the time, there was a large treasure at no great distance which might easily be seized. This had been left by the late nabob, and his mother and widow, the two begums of Oudh, were in possession of it. They were energetic and resolute characters, and had apparently helped to foment the recent rising at Benares. They were also firmly resolved that not a single rupee of their treasure should ever be given to their son. The Government had, indeed, guaranteed in 1775 that the nabob should not pester them with further demands for subsistence. Hastings announced that the begums were implicated in the uproar at Benares, withdrew the guarantee, and allowed the nabob to make an effort for the appropriation of the treasure. His faint-hearted and dilatory proceedings obliged the governor-general himself to interfere. He rigorously imprisoned the two palace eunuchs, whom he believed to be the authors of the recent trouble, and who were by no means the weak and effeminate characters that Macaulay has described, but men of wealth and influence and in command of the army. Impey then happened to be in

the neighbourhood of Benares upon a tour of inspection, and Hastings obtained his opinion upon the case. Impey ruled that if the begums were in rebellion the nabob's Government must necessarily have the power of depriving them of this treasure, which would enable them to carry on war. After all this chicanery the English and the nabob were able to attack the begums, and the governor-general secured a sufficient sum of money to discharge the nabob's debt to the company. It was a transaction which blackened the character of Hastings more, perhaps, than any other. The chief argument in its favour is the fact that he was acting in any interests rather than in his own. Britain was at war with America, Spain, France, and Holland; Hastings was himself struggling with Hyder Ali and the Mahrattas. If he could not raise the indispensable funds, it seemed likely that all the British possessions in India would be lost. Why should the company be kept out of the money due from Oudh because the nabob was too feeble to recover the large treasure upon which he had a very respectable claim? At the same time his coercive measures against women and eunuchs naturally struck the public imagination, and when Sheridan declared that Hastings forced a dagger into the hand of the nabob and made him point it against his mother's breast, he did but express the sentiments of many fair-minded people. Nor was there any necessity for calling Impey into the business.

Towards the close of the American war, two parliamentary committees sat upon Eastern affairs, in one of which the leading spirit was Burke. As a result Impey was recalled, but the proprietors of the company declined to dismiss Hastings and appealed to their legal right, which enabled them to nominate or remove their governor-general upon their own initiative. Hastings therefore remained at his post until the early part of 1785. He was now supreme in the council, India was at peace, the Mahrattas had been pacified, Hyder Ali was dead, and the vast dangers to which the British possession in India had nearly succumbed had been averted by the energy and decision of Hastings. The loss of the American colonies had been a blow, but the loss of India would have been a commercial and financial calamity. France would have taken the place of England in the country, and Great Britain would have been forced to yield in the struggle against her European enemies. Hastings might well consider that, however doubtful some of his methods, they were fully justified by the ultimate results.

In 1785 Hastings returned to England. He had been thirteen years in chief command, and though he had outlived or outstayed all his colleagues his health was broken. Illness had forced his wife to leave India a short time previously, and the wrench of separation had tried him deeply. He found it impossible to work in harmony with his council, and his friends at home advised him that, in view of a possible impeachment, it was unwise for him to remain longer in office. His wife had been already graciously received at court, and Hastings was no less pleased with his own reception upon his

(108) OPENING OF THE TRIAL OF WARREN HASTINGS IN WESTMINSTER HALL, LONDON, 12 FEBRUARY, 1788
From a contemporary drawing by E. Dayes, engraved by R. Pollard.



arrival in England, both by the court and by the public in general. A contemporary annalist gives the following description of him in the fifty-second year of his age: "In person he was thin but not tall, and of spare habit; very bald, with a countenance placid and thoughtful, and, when animated, full of intelligence. In private life he was playful and gay to a degree hardly conceivable, never carrying his political vexations into the bosom of his family. Of a temper so buoyant and elastic that the instant he quitted the Council Board where he had been assailed by every species of opposition, often sharpened by personal acrimony, he mixed in society like a youth upon whom care had never intruded." The English nation at that period had been so accustomed to failure that the return of a man who had preserved a great territory intact amid constant dangers, and had handed it over to his successor, was a new sensation. Hastings himself assumed that his services would far outbalance any arbitrary acts of which he might have been guilty, but Burke and Fox headed a powerful party of enemies who were determined to press for an enquiry into Hastings's Indian administration, for the purpose of gaining some political advantage. If Pitt's ministry opposed the demand they might be accused of conniving at the delinquencies of Hastings, while if they joined in the attack they ran the risk of losing the king's favour. Meanwhile Hastings was negotiating for the purchase of his family estate at Daylesford. The manor house was in a hopelessly dilapidated condition, and he spent a large amount of money, which he could ill afford, in rebuilding the residence and beautifying his future home. In June, 1786, Burke opened fire with the charge that British soldiers had been hired out for the purpose of extirpating the helpless Rohillas. Fox followed with accusations of cruelty and extortion towards the rajah of Benares. On the first charge Burke was defeated; Pitt supported the second, and the hostile vote was carried by a small majority. In February, 1787, Sheridan opened the charge concerning the begums of Oudh, and on 10 May the Commons decided to impeach Hastings at the bar of the House of Lords. The remainder of the year was spent by Hastings in preparing his defence, and on 13 February, 1788, the great trial began in Westminster Hall—a scene that inspired one of Macaulay's most famous passages. Two days were spent in reading out the twenty charges and the defendant's replies thereto. Burke then occupied four days in a speech upon the whole case, a torrent of turbid eloquence which would rather excite disgust at the present day than the admiration which it then aroused. Hastings was charged by the orator with wasting the country, destroying the landed interest, and cruelly harassing the peasants, torturing and degrading their persons and outraging the honour of the whole female race of the district.

The energy and pathos of the great orator extorted expressions of unwanted admiration from the stern and hostile chancellor, and, for a moment,

seemed to pierce even the resolute heart of the defendant. The ladies in the galleries, unaccustomed to such displays of eloquence, excited by the solemnity of the occasion, and perhaps not unwilling to display their taste and sensibility, were in a state of uncontrollable emotion. Handkerchiefs were pulled out; smelling bottles were handed round; hysterical cries and sobs were heard: and Mrs. Sheridan was carried out in a fit. At length the orator concluded. Raising his voice till the old arches of Irish oak resounded, "Therefore", said he, "hath it with all confidence been ordered by the Commons of Great Britain that I impeach Warren Hastings of high crimes and misdemeanours. I impeach him in the name of the Commons' House of Parliament, whose trust he has betrayed. I impeach him in the name of the English nation, whose ancient honour he has sullied. I impeach him in the name of the people of India, whose rights he has trodden under foot, and whose country he has turned into a desert. Lastly, in the name of human nature itself, in the name of both sexes, in the name of every age, in the name of every rank, I impeach the common enemy and oppressor of all!"

Then followed the discussion of points of procedure, the speeches of Fox and Grey upon the Benares charge, and Sheridan's speech on the begums, which he theatrically concluded by sinking into the arms of Burke. Eventually the court adjourned to the following year, after sitting for thirty-five days. In the following year seventeen sittings only were taken, and in 1790 Parliament was dissolved, so that little was done. Three more years were spent in hearing the case for the defence, and not until 1795 was the decision given. Hastings was acquitted upon every count, and thus returned with a complete victory. But his expenses amounted to nearly £100,000; he had been living up to his income, and though he left the court cleared in public estimation he left it a ruined man.

The directors and proprietors of the company eventually granted him a pension of £4000 for twenty-eight years and a loan of £50,000 free of interest. He was thus able to live the life of a country gentleman at Daylesford, paying occasional visits to London with his wife. He occupied his time in breeding stock and attempting to acclimatize Indian fruits and vegetables, in desultory reading and literary amusements. He made one further appearance before Parliament in 1813, when the company's charter was under revision. The examination lasted for three or four hours, and as he was retiring the members simultaneously rose with their heads uncovered and stood in silence until he had left the House, a compliment repeated by the Lords, much to his pleasure. He received his doctor's degree at Oxford, was made a privy councillor and graciously welcomed by the prince regent. In 1818 his health began to grow worse, and on 22 August of that year he died at the age of eighty-six. He had lived to see nearly all India brought under British rule, and was able to realize that his own achievements had not been wrought in vain.

Hastings was in a sense a self-made man. Shipped off to India as an untrained schoolboy, he had gained his experience in the hardest of hard schools, amid adventurous Englishmen not overburdened

Warren Hastings

with scruples in dealing with a subject population whose habits of thought and character were entirely unknown to the majority of Europeans. It was a school not likely to teach any great respect for consistency, or any great deference for precedent. Civilized conventions were unknown and unrecognized, and the strong man armed was obviously the greatest power in the land. The natural aptitudes of Hastings were made prominent by these conditions. His self-reliance, his infinite and indomitable patience, and his fertility of resource, enabled him to rise superior to every difficulty, and if his rule was often autocratic there is no doubt whatever that it was popular. The universal expressions of regret at his departure are evidence of the high esteem in which all classes of the Indian community held him. He had a genius for administration and for organization, and the natives themselves admitted that they were better off under his government than under any other rule. On the other hand, in an age of conquest and irregular tenure, when might was often right, he was expected to govern upon principles which were often as impracticable in India as they were permanent in Europe. Hence he occasionally did things which are not easy to justify and can readily be condemned. The wonder is that a man of his autocratic temper and of his peculiar training should have kept so entirely within the limits of the conventional, nor has his financial probity ever been successfully impugned.

CHAPTER III

Rousseau (A.D. 1712-1778)

Rousseau, if not the first, was the leading spirit in the passionate protest against the inequalities prevalent in the French social system and government which were expressed before and during his lifetime by Montesquieu, Voltaire, and d'Alembert. The fountain-head of the critical philosophy which was then preached and taught is to be found in England; from the death of Louis XIV until the outbreak of the French Revolution the face of the literary and philosophical French world was turned towards England. Such thinkers as Sir Isaac Newton, Lord Shaftesbury, and Lord Bolingbroke profoundly influenced French science and philosophy. Much of Voltaire's work was mere popularization of the works of Newton and the philosophy of Locke. No less was the debt to England owed by the Encyclopædistes, Diderot and d'Alembert, who compiled their enormous work in order to provide mankind with a new philosophical system intended to supersede the old ideas which had been founded not upon science but upon authority. These thinkers and writers were therefore the pioneers of the movement which began in 1789. They aroused hatred and contempt for existing political and ecclesiastical institutions, and, while they excited an ardent discontent with the established order of things, they also, and inevitably, aroused a longing for innovation and change. They spoke to a people by nature impulsive and imaginative, and driven to exasperation or despair by the oppressive burdens of an artificial and outworn social system. A nation which in past centuries had been foremost in the romantic movement for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre was not likely to be backward in the no less inspiring crusade for the recovery of the rights of man.

Jean Jacques Rousseau was born in Geneva on 28 June, 1712. "I was born", he says, "weak and sickly. I cost my mother her life, and my birth was the first of my misfortunes." His father, an impulsive and selfish sentimentalist, neglected his children except for the fact that he taught Jean Jacques to read. The two would spend nights in the perusal of romances, dangerously stimulating to the boy's passionate and imaginative nature. When these were exhausted they could fall back upon more serious books which Rousseau's grandfather had left to the family, Plutarch's *Lives*, Bossuet's *Discourse on Universal History*, Fontenelle's *Dialogues of the Dead*, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The stories of Plutarch made a great impression upon young Rousseau,

and produced, in his own words, "that republican spirit and love of liberty which made him impatient of restraint or servitude". In 1722 this mode of existence was brought to an end, for the reason that his father was involved in a quarrel with an officer of Geneva who had friends at court, and preferred to leave his country rather than run the risk of an unjust condemnation. Jean Jacques was then sent to school at the neighbouring village of Bossey, where he learned, "along with Latin all the medley of sorry stuff with which, under the name of education, they accompany it". In 1724 he was living in his uncle's house, and, at the age of thirteen, was apprenticed to a notary. Neither master nor apprentice derived the smallest satisfaction from their association. Rousseau hated the work, and his master pronounced him stupid, an opinion very probably correct. Rousseau then became apprentice to an engraver, a coarse and violent character who stupefied and demoralized him with his cruelty. Eventually he ran away and began an existence worthy of the hero of a picaresque novel. A neighbouring priest gave him food and sent him to a certain Mme de Warens at Annecy, who was to convert him from Protestantism to the true Church. The priests of Savoy were at that period waging systematic war against the Protestants of Geneva, and made every effort to secure every possible convert. Rousseau made his way to Annecy expecting to find some grey and wrinkled beldame who would preach him into Catholicism by mere expenditure of words. He was surprised to find that a reputation for good works did not, in this case, preclude the possession of good looks. Mme de Warens proved to be a fascinating lady of twenty-eight, who decided, after consultation with her adviser, that Rousseau should go to Turin and enter a monastery, where he might be converted in due course. Delighted with the idea of seeing the world, he started off, and in a few days reached Turin and disillusionment. He found in the monastery some half-dozen fellow catechumens, who went from town to town pretending to be Moors or Infidels in order to gain food and lodging from the priests while the work of their conversion was in progress. Rousseau was disgusted with their society, and admitted that his conversion was a sheer piece of hypocrisy, which he accepted because he could not return to Geneva and saw nothing else to do in his destitute condition. The charitable spectators of his admission to the Church provided him with a collection of some 20 francs, and after the ceremony he was turned into the streets of Turin with this amount and left to shift for himself. He slept in low lodging-houses, obtained situations as a servant and lost them, displayed the sentimentalism which filled a great part of his nature, imagining himself in love with every other woman he met. One circumstance that was of some importance for his future development was the impression made upon him by the music which he heard in Turin. For music his passion was afterwards so great that he could find pleasure in the poorest performance if only the instruments were in tune. In 1729 he left Turin with a companion and begged his way to Annecy, where he was kindly

received by Mme de Warens, who took him into her household and provided him with occupation. She had inherited from her father a fancy for alchemy, and spent a vast amount of time and money which she could ill afford upon retorts, drugs, chemicals, herbs, and impostors who professed their capacity to make her fortune. Rousseau's business was to transcribe recipes, sort herbs collected in the mountains, and pound the drugs. Mme de Warens showed him great affection, called him her child, and made of him rather a companion than a servant. At length, however, it was agreed that he must earn his living, and the relations of his patroness came to the conclusion that he was only fitted to be a village priest. He was sent to the seminary to learn Latin enough to fit him for that profession. His progress was exceedingly slow, and eventually his teachers reported that he was not clever enough even to become a village priest.

He therefore resolved to try his hand at music, and spent most of the winter with Lemaitre, the choirmaster of the cathedral, a character as irregular and disorderly as Rousseau himself. Lemaitre quarrelled with the precentor, left Annecy with Rousseau, and the pair begged their way as far as Lyons. There Rousseau deserted his companion at the moment when he was seized with an epileptic fit, and made his way back to Mme de Warens. But when he reached Annecy he found that she had gone without leaving any address behind her. He came to Lausanne and announced his profession as a music teacher, on the strength of which a good-natured landlord gave him board and lodging until he should earn enough by teaching to pay for it. Fond as he was of music he knew absolutely nothing of the art, and could not even read a tune at sight. Yet he gave himself out as a composer, and actually undertook to compose a concert piece for a professor in Lausanne, who was one of the leading lights in the musical world, and, with an effrontery which might reasonably be mistaken for insanity, he actually wrote a full score and put the piece in rehearsal. With the amazing candour of his *Confessions* he thus describes the result:

The musicians choked with laughter, the audience opened their eyes and wished that they could have shut their ears. I was bold enough to continue, perspiring at every pore, red with shame, but not daring to fly. For my consolation I heard round me the audience saying in one another's ears, or rather in mine, "How appalling! what discords! what a diabolical noise!" I need not paint my anguish nor need I own that I richly deserved it.

Even after this performance by some miracle he got one or two pupils, and by dint of teaching learned something of the art of music. He afterwards removed to Neuchâtel, and in the spring of 1731 he fell in with an Archimandrite of the Greek Church, who was travelling in Europe to collect subscriptions for the restoration of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. This ecclesiastic spoke nothing but Greek and Italian, and Rousseau became his interpreter. When they reached Soleure the French ambassador felt an interest in Rousseau, and, after hearing his story, sent him to Paris as attendant to a young

officer. But Paris soon tired him, and he travelled back on foot to his beloved Annecy, as he had heard that Mme de Warens had returned home. Such travels were the happiest part of his life. He thought most readily while he was walking, and while his sense of the beauties of Nature was stimulated he gained experience at first hand of the social conditions against which he was afterwards to draw so terrible an indictment. Such vagrancy might have degraded a lesser mind, but to Rousseau it was merely stimulating, as the following passage from his *Confessions* will show:

I remember passing one delicious night outside Lyons. It had been very hot that day, and the evening was delightful. The dew moistened the grass, the night was profoundly still, and the air though fresh was not cold. The sunset had left red vapours in the heavens which coloured the water rosy red. The trees and the terraces sheltered nightingales which answered one another. I walked in a kind of ecstasy, surrendering my heart and senses to the enjoyment of it all, and only sighing with some regretfulness that I must enjoy it alone. Absorbed in these sweet musings I prolonged my walk far into the night without perceiving that I was weary. When at length I found this out, I lay down voluptuously on the shelf of a kind of niche or false doorway in the wall of a terrace. The canopy of my bed was formed by overarching treetops, a nightingale was exactly over my head and I fell asleep to his song. My sleep was sweet but my awakening yet more delicious. It was broad day, and my opening eyes beheld water, green vegetation, and an adorable landscape. I rose and shook myself; hunger came upon me, and I started gaily for the town to spend upon a good breakfast the two pieces of money that were left to me; so high were my spirits that I sang lustily as I went along the way.

A picture of another kind is often quoted. One day Rousseau had lost himself, and entered a peasant's hut to ask for food. He was offered skimmed milk and coarse barley bread. When, after cross-examination, the peasant realized the true character of his guest he descended to his cellar by a small trapdoor and returned with good brown bread, a ham, a bottle of wine, and an omelette. Rousseau could not understand the reason of this secrecy, being himself a Swiss and unlearned in the mysteries of French tax collecting. The peasant made him understand that he hid his wine and bread to escape the duties upon them, and that he would be ruined if it was thought that he was not starving. "All this", says Rousseau, "made upon me an ineffaceable impression. Here was the origin of that inextinguishable hatred which afterwards grew up in my heart against the vexations which harass the common people, and against their oppressors. This man was well off, but did not dare to eat of the bread he had gained by the sweat of his brow, and could only avoid ruin by displaying the same poverty as that which reigned around him. I came out of his house as indignant as I was sad, deplored the fate of these beautiful countries on which Nature has lavished so many gifts only to make them the prey of barbarous tax gatherers."

In the spring of 1732 Rousseau arrived at Chambéry, where

European History

Mme de Warens was living with a certain steward, Claud Anet, who had a knowledge of herbs and managed her business affairs. Charles Emmanuel III of Savoy had ordered a new land survey of the country, and Rousseau found employment as a clerk in the office of the surveyor. The whole business was most uncongenial to him, and, with his inevitable habit of running away from anything which he did not like, he threw up this employment and again attempted to make a livelihood as a music teacher. For the most part he was entirely dependent upon Mme de Warens for his livelihood. When her steward died he took over the management of her affairs, and speedily involved them in fearful confusion. A more unbusinesslike character could hardly have been found. When he taught music he could never make or keep an appointment for a lesson, and the temptation of the moment invariably overcame the obligation of a future engagement. In the summer of 1736 Rousseau had a dangerous illness, and country air became a necessity. He induced Mme de Warens to leave her gloomy house in Chambéry and to take Les Charmettes, a modest farmhouse not far from Chambéry, which still stands, and contains some memorials of Rousseau at this period of his life. It was perhaps the happiest period of his existence. He enjoyed the country air, the business of the farm, the opportunity for the contemplation of nature and for study in his own desultory fashion, while Mme de Warens gave him precisely the amount of attention which his sentimental nature desired. His reading was mostly directed to the philosophers of the age, Locke, Descartes, and Leibnitz. Voltaire's *Lettres Philosophiques* greatly stimulated his literary interest at this moment, and he began to arrange his reading upon some more continuous system. System, however, of any kind was impossible for him. He describes his vain efforts to learn geometry, and the fact that the effort to remember one rule of Latin grammar drove all the others out of his head. He dabbled in theology and the Jansenist controversy, and disturbed himself with questions about free will and predestination. The idea of hell caused him considerable mental anguish, and an oft-quoted story may be quoted once more as a typical instance of the manner in which Rousseau was accustomed to settle a large number of intellectual problems.

One day, thinking of this sad subject, I occupied myself mechanically by throwing stones against the trunks of trees with my usual dexterity, that is to say, without hitting one. All at once, in the midst of this fine exercise, I bethought myself of making it a kind of prognostic to calm my disquietude. I said to myself, "I will throw this stone against the tree opposite; if I touch it, that will be a sign of salvation; if I miss, it will be a sign of damnation". As I said this, I threw the stone with trembling hand and a terrible beating of the heart, but so happily that it struck the middle of the tree, which was not a very difficult feat, seeing that I had chosen one very thick and very near. Since then I have never doubted of my salvation.

In this way Rousseau made his inclinations the basis of his convictions upon many other subjects.



VOLTAIRE

After portrait by Alix



MONTESQUIEU

From engraving after drawing by Deveria



BUFFON

From engraving after painting by Drouais



DIDEROT

After Paulus

At the end of 1737 Rousseau's health seems to have given way again. Among the many subjects he had smattered was included physiology, with the natural result that he imagined himself subject to some mortal disease, and went to consult the faculty of Montpellier. When he returned to Chambéry he found that he had been supplanted in the house of Mme de Warens by a new favourite, and in 1740 he seized the opportunity of moving to Lyons, where he became tutor to the sons of M. de Mably, the elder brother of the famous Condillac. As a tutor he was a dismal failure; he could neither control nor influence his pupils, though, like many another failure, he afterwards became famous as a theorist upon education. Eventually he went back to Les Charmettes, but was unable to oust the intruder who had taken his place. He therefore resolved to make his way to Paris. He had written a comedy, and he had also in his pocket 15 louis and a new scheme of musical notation by which he hoped to make his fortune. M. de Mably gave him letters of introduction to literary people, and the Duc de Richelieu had promised him his patronage. A new period of his life was about to begin, and a prophet of his future would have been fully justified in predicting beggary and failure as the outcome of it. A sentimental vagabond, unable to apply himself seriously to any pursuit, or to make a success of any business, unashamed of his dependency upon others, amenable to high moral enthusiasm but equally prone to base immoral action, was not the kind of character to succeed in the struggle for life in a crowded capital. What no prophet could have seen was the fact that Rousseau had a delicate sense of style in literature and a real interest and enthusiasm for social questions.

Rousseau entered Paris at the time when some of the greatest figures in French literature were to be found there. Voltaire, at the height of his fame, was living amid luxury and admiration; d'Alembert, though five years younger than Rousseau, was even then famous. Montesquieu was preparing the first draft of his *Esprits des Lois*; Buffon was in the midst of his great work on Natural History; and Diderot, who was about Rousseau's own age, was living a Bohemian, Grub Street life, working at such literary potboiling as he could procure, and thankful to accept a dinner. In 1742 Rousseau was able to submit his musical theory to the criticism of the Academy of Sciences. A committee of three musical ignoramuses granted him a certificate full of compliments, but gave him and the public to understand that the scheme was neither useful nor new. The object of Rousseau's invention was to supersede the use of different keys and to facilitate transposition by a simpler method of notation. He succeeded in getting an account of it published, which brought him neither money nor reputation. He was also able to increase his acquaintance with men of letters, and eventually obtained an appointment as secretary to the French ambassador at Venice, an avaricious imbecile, with whom he quarrelled. He returned to Paris in 1744, and shortly afterwards took place his union with Thérèse le Vasseur. She was

a kitchen maid or seamstress employed by the landlady of a small and dirty hotel where Rousseau was staying. Amid the brutal jests of the rough society which frequented the establishment the girl bore herself with apparent modesty and self-control. Rousseau took pity on her, and pity became affection. Subsequent events would seem to show that her apparent modesty was due to impenetrable stupidity. She could never be taught to read with the least fluency, and the spelling of her letters would bewilder a trained phonetician. She could not add a simple column of figures or even repeat the twelve months of the year in order. She was also greedy, avaricious, and deceitful. His friends came to regard his choice as the most notable disaster of his life, and yet Rousseau persistently described Thérèse as the only consolation that Heaven had bestowed upon him. He was, of course, by birth a member of the lower classes, and so much the pair had in common. Rousseau had no taste for luxuries, nor did he require intellectual stimulus or equality. He required no more from Thérèse than he needed from nature, easy companionship and the gentle pleasures that contemplation can give. An energetic and intellectual wife would probably have been the end of his career.

Meanwhile Rousseau was busy working for the stage; he also became literary secretary to Mme Dupin and her stepson, working at her house in the day and going back to Thérèse and his garret at night. He wrote an essay on music for Diderot's dictionary, but these occupations brought in very little money and his domestic cares were increasing. When a child was born, Rousseau resolved to send it to a foundling hospital, and repeated this determination in the case of four succeeding children, to the intense grief of the mother. He attempted to excuse this heartless conduct on the grounds of his poverty and his own incompetence as a father. His usual sentiment became an excuse for pretended convictions, but the arguments by which Rousseau attempts to cloak his action can only be defined as hypocrisy and cant. What became of the children has never been discovered, as their father did not avail himself of the simplest means of preserving their identity.

In 1794 Rousseau found his true vocation. One afternoon, when he was on his way to visit Diderot, who had been imprisoned at Vincennes for his letter to the blind, he read the *Mercure de France* as he walked, and observed an announcement that the Academy of Dijon was offering a prize for an essay upon the question: "Has the Restoration of the Sciences Contributed to Corrupt or to Purify Morals?" Rousseau's description of his sensations when he saw this announcement is worthy of quotation:

All at once I felt myself dazzled by a thousand sparkling lights. Vivid ideas thronged into my mind with a force and confusion that threw me into inexpressible agitation. My head whirled in a giddiness as though I were intoxicated and violent palpitation oppressed me. Unable to walk for shortness of breath I sank down under one of the trees of the avenue, and spent half an hour in such excitement that when I rose I saw that the front of my

waistcoat was wet with tears which I had unconsciously shed. Could I only have written a quarter of what I saw and felt under the tree, with what clearness I should have exposed all the contradictions of our social system; with what simplicity I should have demonstrated that man is naturally good, and that by institutions only is he made bad!

The story that Rousseau originally intended to argue that the advance of science had tended to purify morals is in complete contradiction of his character up to this point. If one thing interested him more than another it was the subject of political science. His thoughts and observations had brought him to the conclusion that society as he knew it was corrupt and intolerable, and that a new basis must be sought for its reconstruction. His essay gained the prize, and it is inconceivable that he should have contemplated writing an essay in praise of the condition of society, or that it would ever have attracted the smallest attention had he thus completed it.

Thus Rousseau began a series of writings which were produced within a dozen years and gave Europe a new gospel. Of this first attempt Rousseau himself uttered a very fair criticism. He regarded it as absolutely wanting in logic and order, though full of heat and force. What Rousseau no doubt intended to say was that the success of the state depends upon the height and the standards of the social duty which the citizens accept and upon their willingness to conform to it. This is a matter which is in no way affected by the progress or the decadence of science or art as such, and a nation may advance to a very high knowledge of natural laws and at the same time pursue standards of morality utterly corrupt. This truth, after which he was groping, is obscured by a mist of *ex parte* rhetorical statements and by false analogies and doubtful historical parallels. One particular error, to which we shall have to return, Rousseau derived partly from his study of Plato in translation, and partly from his Swiss experience, that a lawgiver can model a state entirely according to his own purpose and desire. He was never able to appreciate the fact that most nations enjoy precisely that kind of constitution which they deserve. The vigour of his denunciation attracted attention, and the brilliant outspokenness with which he attacked social corruption actually brought him to the height of popularity. Society is always ready to hear itself denounced provided that no names are mentioned.

Rousseau's employer was made receiver of general finance in 1750, and offered his clerk the post of cashier. Rousseau, however, was anxious to live up to the principles which he had enounced in his essay, while he had a profound and inherent dislike of offices. He resigned his appointment and gave up his finery to begin a life of ostentatious poverty, refusing presents and invitations. The former, however, were accepted by Thérèse and her relations, and all that Rousseau gained was a reputation for eccentricity. However, he was able to go into society and meet most of the famous people of the age. Meanwhile he went on with the hack work of copying music, and wrote

European History

an article for Diderot's *Encyclopædia* upon "Political Economy", which contained the germ of the theories afterwards developed in his *Social Contract*. In 1753 he gained a theatrical success with his operatic piece, *The Village Sorcerer*, which attracted a favourable notice from the king, while its fresh and lively tunes were in everyone's mouth. He also exerted a beneficial influence upon French music in so far as he taught the orchestra and performers that their rendering need not necessarily be given fortissimo. In a controversy concerning the relative merits of French and Italian music, aroused by the appearance of an Italian operatic company in Paris, Rousseau took the side of the Italians and concluded his argument with the words: "I believe that I have shown that there is neither time nor melody in France, because its language is not susceptible of it, and that the French song is a continual braying, that the harmony of it is brutal, and that French tunes are not tunes. Whence I conclude that the French have no music and cannot have, or that if they have, so much the worse for them." The pressing problems of domestic politics were forgotten and the whole of Paris was agog with this musical controversy. Rousseau's own orchestra burnt him in effigy, as they resented his teaching during the rehearsals of *The Village Sorcerer*. There is no doubt that he was perfectly right, and, however great his incapacities as a teacher may originally have been, his subsequent studies and his visit to Italy had made him an authority on the subject.

In the year 1753 the Academy of Dijon again offered as the subject of a prize essay the question: "What is the Origin of Inequality Among Men, and is it Authorized by Natural Law?" Rousseau's essay upon this occasion was unsuccessful in gaining the prize, but it is noteworthy as containing the first draft of the ideas afterwards developed in the *Social Contract*. He attacked the subject by describing the natural state of man and comparing it with the conditions of his own time. The primitive man and the natural state which he admires were evolved in detail from the depths of his inner consciousness, and anyone with the smallest acquaintance with the conditions under which the modern science of anthropology is carried on would immediately dismiss the whole treatise as worthless. The scientific method of social science had not, however, then been discovered, a priori theories were thought just as valuable as any others, and the imagination of salons and literary coteries was perfectly ready and able to depict the primitive man, his cave, his family, his utensils, and his mode of life with as much assurance as any traveller who had traversed the uncivilized world. Buffon's famous description of the sensations of the first man at the moment of his creation is a case in point. Briefly speaking, the argument is as follows: In the state of nature man lived in isolation, and questions even of physical equality did not arise. The physical or material accidents which first enjoined joint labour made the fact of inequality apparent, but not necessarily harmful. When the discovery of the arts of agriculture and metalworking arose, the

idea of property began, since which time the divergency between rich and poor has increased and society has gradually deteriorated. Once again Rousseau is groping for an idea which is not clearly realized. He does not state whether the inequality which he deplores is inequality of material possessions or inequality of political rights. Nor is any recipe given for the removal of the evil which he did not understand. But when he concluded with the words: "It is manifestly contrary to the law of Nature, however defined, that a child should command an old man, or that a handful of people should abound with superfluities while a famishing multitude is without even necessities", he was speaking the language which was repeated with fearful intensity forty years later in the revolutionary clubs of Paris. Other more consistent writers have treated of the same subject, but none with such fiery rhetoric, and none commanded such universal attention. Rousseau sent a copy of his work to Voltaire, who replied: "No one has ever employed so much intellect in trying to make us beasts. One longs to walk on all-fours when one reads your book", criticism which did not touch the point in the least, however amusing it may have been at the time.

In 1754 Rousseau returned to Geneva and went out of his way to see Mme de Warens, whom he found old, in poverty and degradation, without any trace of her former beauty and brilliancy. He did what he could to relieve her necessities, but she declined to join him. In Geneva he was enthusiastically welcomed by the citizens, and, finding that his profession of Roman Catholicism prevented him from exerting his rights of citizenship, he resolved to return to Protestantism, not a very difficult moral feat in view of the circumstances under which his former conversion had been accomplished. He did not, however, feel easy in the neighbourhood of Voltaire, who he thought was corrupting the citizens with his cynical teaching; and Geneva did not display precisely that pitch of enthusiasm about the publication of the *Treatise on Equality* which he thought was his due. What he really wanted was a country house where he might live in seclusion from the noise and bustle of the world, and when Mme d'Epinay offered him a small farmhouse at Chevrette he considered that he had attained the summit of human happiness. There he lived for a considerable time, copying music, working at treatises which ultimately became the *Social Contract* and *Emile*, and seeing much of Mme d'Epinay when she was at Chevrette. A large part of his time was spent in the woods absorbed in the contemplation of Nature. "My imagination", he says, "did not leave long deserted the land so adorned. I soon peopled it with beings according to my heart, and driving far away all prejudices and factitious passions I transported into these natural retreats inhabitants worthy of them. I formed a charming society of which I did not feel myself unworthy. I made for myself a golden age, and filled these lovely days with all the scenes of my life which left me sweet memories, all those which my heart can yet desire." The outcome of these overwrought paroxysms of imagination was his novel, *La Nouvelle*

Héloïse, which was, however, stimulated by the visits of a sister of Mme d'Epinay, one Mme d'Houdetot, with whom Rousseau fell desperately in love. Her affections were otherwise engaged, but at the same time they confided their feelings to one another in a melancholy of sweet despair, and rarely has exasperated sentimentalism reached such a pitch as in those passages where Rousseau describes the progress of this acquaintanceship. Moreover, solitude did not improve Rousseau's sense of gratitude towards his benefactors, and a quarrel with Mme d'Epinay obliged him to leave the Hermitage. He then settled at Montlouis. Voltaire had built a theatre at Geneva for the production of his own tragedies, and took a malicious delight in inviting the Calvinist population of Geneva to witness the performances. Rousseau was thereby induced to send out a counterblast against the theatre and the moral corruption which it produced, though he was himself a playwright. He had also come into conflict with the sage of Ferney upon another subject. In 1756 Voltaire had published his poem upon the great earthquake at Lisbon, which drew from that appalling calamity the restatement of the eternal question, how such human suffering can be reconciled with the belief in a free and benevolent Deity. If Lisbon deserved to be wiped out, why should Paris be spared? The only attitude possible for thinking men was one of pure scepticism. Rousseau replied to this by insisting upon his favourite doctrine that not God but society is the cause of this and all human evils. At Lisbon, for instance, if society had not drawn people together to live in a crowded city the disaster would have caused little loss of life. Rousseau here had the worst of the argument. To him there is no such thing as evil but merely mal-adjustment. His definition, however, depends upon a mere juggling with terms, whereas Voltaire spoke a language of definite philosophy, if a philosophy of despair. After this quarrel the two great leaders of rational thought and sentimental philosophy remained not merely in contradiction but in open hostility.

The duke and duchess of Luxembourg spent some time every year in their château of Montmorency, not far from Montlouis. The duke and duchess called upon Rousseau, and inclined though he was to shrink from the acquaintance of the great, he was completely over-powered by their kindness. When he began to give daily readings to the duchess from the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, her admiration for his talent was unbounded. Her noble friends, who were also present at the readings, spread reports of the new work, and when it appeared at the end of 1760 the whole of Paris was desperately anxious to procure copies. Booksellers actually let it out at twelve sous a volume for an hour at a time. Rousseau relates that the Princess de Talmont took up a volume to pass half an hour before setting out for the carnival ball, and was unable to put it down until she had finished it, forgetting ball, horses, and every other engagement for the evening. In 1762 *Emile* was published, and a few months earlier the *Social Contract* had appeared. These works were printed abroad in Amsterdam. The

publication at that time of any work which dealt with current events or criticized society was a matter of considerable difficulty. We have seen that Diderot was imprisoned for an article in his *Encyclopædia*, and any criticism which might conceivably be thought to affect any person of noble birth, even if no names were mentioned, involved the author in some risk of martyrdom, for which Rousseau, at any rate, had no taste. Author and publisher in such cases were therefore united as accomplices in a conspiracy rather than as business men in an innocent transaction. Books had to be printed in Holland, smuggled into France, and distributed by subterranean methods. Many philosophical writers escaped annoyance by the use of pseudonyms. Voltaire, for instance, calmly denied the authorship of many works notoriously from his pen, but Rousseau was too proud to adopt any such subterfuges, and signed his name to everything he wrote.

La Nouvelle Héloïse owes a great deal to the style of novel initiated by Richardson in England. *Sir Charles Grandison* and *Pamela* were at that moment great favourites in France. Rousseau borrowed the cumbrous form of letters for telling his story, which, at any rate, suited his temperament, as it did not bind him down to any strict pursuit of his plot and allowed him to make such digressions as he pleased. Hence transports of wild and ecstatic love, of disappointed affections, and bitter social satire alternate with homilies upon infant education, landscape gardening, and beautiful sketches of rural life and country scenery. Probably the work is only read nowadays by searchers who desire to gather materials for a life of Rousseau or for histories of literature. The artificiality of the sentiment, the rapidity and ease with which the characters burst into tears and declaim high-flown maxims at every crisis, the absolute want of anything in the nature of humour, make the book appallingly heavy reading to those accustomed to modern fiction. The hero, St. Preux, is introduced when acting as tutor to the daughter of the Baron d'Étanges. Naturally a guilty and passionate affection rises between them. As the title implies, the story is a repetition of the case of Abelard and Héloïse. The baron refuses to allow his daughter to marry one inferior in rank to herself. An English nobleman, Lord Bomston, who plays the part of the benevolent mediator, is unable to move him, and St. Preux is obliged to leave amid the floods of tears and prolonged moans and the stilted outpourings of grief which the sentiment of those days considered inevitable. St. Preux then goes to Paris, whence he writes letters to Julie, criticizing society as he finds it. The discovery of these letters causes a tremendous disturbance. Julie is obliged to abandon her lover, whose frantic despair results in an attack of smallpox. Her father forces her to marry a M. de Wolmar, a calm and prudent character fifty years of age. St. Preux is induced by Lord Bomston to abandon his intention of committing suicide and to sail round the world with Admiral Anson in his famous voyage. Six years later he returns to France, and Wolmar, though perfectly well aware of the relations existing

European History

between St. Preux and Julie, none the less invites him to the house, and leaves the lovers together with serene confidence in the faithfulness of his wife. Julie has thrown away her old life, has buried the past, and the rest of the book is devoted to a description of patriarchal life upon an estate where master and mistress educate their children, care for their servants, and conduct a household in which perfect harmony prevails. The story ends abruptly with the death of Julie. As a result of an attempt to save her child from drowning she falls ill, and in an impressive deathbed scene she commends St. Preux to the care of her husband, and also entrusts him with the education of her children.

Strange as it may seem to us, the new *Héloïse* was not only popular, but it also exerted a real and positive influence upon society. The social fad now known as the simple life became popular after the publication of this work. To return to nature, to consider the poor, to admire the country, and generally to behave with sensibility, using the term in Jane Austen's sense, became for the time fashionable. No doubt it was a means of gaining a new sensation. The artificiality of court and social life led to hopeless boredom. But it is also true that Rousseau influenced people and made them realize that the country was worth looking at. Under the influence of Louis XIV and his artists and landscape gardeners the idea had prevailed that Nature, in her riot and wildness, was an unlovely thing, and that she required to be properly adorned and embellished before she was fit for the contemplation of noble eyes. Gardens must be laid out with mathematical precision, flower-beds in geometrical figures, and yew trees must be cut into the forms of peacocks, animals, and statues, in a form as remote as possible from the tangled luxuriance of Mme de Wolmar's "Elysium" at Clarens, where Rousseau lovingly describes Nature, luxuriant and unrestrained, with a great variety of shrubs and flowers growing in natural profusion and enlivened by the songs of innumerable birds. Rousseau introduced a change in landscape gardening and also in the outlook upon wilder scenery. Even Englishmen had been unable to admire fine scenery before Rousseau wrote. Gray considered that the Mont Cenis was "frightful", and Goldsmith complained of the hills and rocks in Scotland which "intercepted every prospect, while every part of the country presents the same dismal landscape". To Rousseau's inspiration are due the descriptions of scenery in Bernardin de St. Pierre's *Paul and Virginia*, and in Chateaubriand's *Atala* and *René*, while the scenes of domestic life provided manifold suggestions for the sentimental school in Germany, as may be seen from a perusal of *Werther*.

"Man is born free and is everywhere in chains." These were the opening words of the *Social Contract*, which provided the war cry for the oppressed and downtrodden of the next generation. They are in themselves a sufficient proclamation of the method pursued in this treatise. What is freedom, and how is man born free? Rousseau has no explanation to give. If a man is born in a state of isolation

les pas servir au delà de mes forces.

Ce reproche, Monsieur, me paroît peu reconnoissable de leur part et peu raisonnable de la vôtre. Quand un homme revient d'un long combat hors d'haleines et couvert de blessures; est-il temps de l'exhorter à prendre les armes tandis qu'on se tient soi-même en repos? Oh, allez-y! chacun son tour, je vous prie. Si vous êtes si curieux des coups, allez-en cherchez votre part; pour moi, j'en ai bien la miens: il est temps de songer à la retraite; mes cheveux gris m'avertissent que je ne suis plus qu'un vétéran, mes maux et mes malheurs me prescrivent le repos, et je ne sors point de la tice sans y avoir payé de ma personne. Sal Patriæ Patriaque datum. Prenez mon rang, jeunes gens, je vous le cède; gardez-le dans votre vigueur comme j'ai fait dans la mienne, et après cela ne vous tourmentez pas plus des exhortations indiscrettes et des reproches déplacés que je ne m'en tourmenterai désormais.

Ainsi, Monsieur, je confirme à loijir ce que vous m'accusez d'avoir écrit à la hâte, et que vous jugez n'être pas digne de moi; jugement auquel j'inviterai de répondre faute de l'entendre suffisamment.

Reverez, Monsieur, je vous supplie, les assurances de mon respectueux

Bon plaisir

he perishes forthwith; if he is born a member of a family his freedom is somewhat limited. In Rome, Greece, and Palestine nobody was born free in the sense in which Rousseau seems to have used the term, and his historical learning went very little beyond the confines of these countries. Once more, as in dealing with the question of equality, Rousseau has no notion of using the historical method. His principles, as he says, "come from the nature of things and are based on reason". The basis of the book is the theory which he had previously enounced, namely, that society is in a state rather of retrogression than of progress, and that society is really to blame for the social evils of which so many complained. In the present instance he grants the existence of the state and the institution of property; the question before him is to find a basis for the institution of government, and this he discovers in the dogma of the sovereignty of the people. Such Continental writers upon constitutional theory as Grotius and Puffendorf were known to Rousseau, but his chief inspiration was drawn from England. The Gallican Church was entirely monarchical and never questioned the divine right of kings. Bossuet preached that even though the rulers acted as wolves the subjects were bound to remain as sheep. This theory, however, had been severely attacked in other quarters. When the States-General of Holland threw off the yoke of Philip of Spain, they had advanced a theory of government which considerably modified the divine right of kings. The English philosopher Locke argued that a contract existed between prince and people, a breach of which was enough to justify revolution; and after the protectorate and Cromwell, and the change of dynasty at the Hanoverian succession, the logic of facts had proved too much for the theory of divine right, at any rate in England. Neither contract nor divine right could be historically justified. In both cases thinkers went astray, because the method of their age allowed them to reason a priori and to evolve complicated systems of social government and constitutional law which the smallest historical investigation would have proved to be quite untenable. Rousseau's system is delightfully harmonious and of a fascinating simplicity. The rights upon which he insists are based upon "nature" or are "found in the nature of things". As a contribution to the theory of constitutional government the work is absolutely valueless, but as a contribution to the historical development of the succeeding generation its importance is almost unbounded. The *Social Contract* became the gospel of the Jacobin party, and the course of political events in France during the early part of 1794 cannot be understood except as the outcome of Rousseau's teaching. The real cause of its influence was not so much the theories which it enounced, all of which had been floating in the air and were the common property of many men, as the manner in which they were stated. Rousseau provided a series of catchwords which everybody could shout, and which seemed to solve the question and to save men the trouble of thinking.

"Sovereignty is indivisible not only in principle but in object.

Sovereignty, being only the exercise of the general will, can never be alienated. Laws being only authoritative acts of the general will, the sovereign cannot act unless the people be assembled. The sovereign, having no other force than the legislative power, commands only by laws." These statements became to men exasperated by generations of oppression precisely what dogmas may be to a sect of fanatics, and were crystallized in the phrase: "Liberty, equality, and fraternity". Given the fact that society is based upon an act of partnership, upon a contract, then the parties to the contract must obviously be equal. Such equality implies that their association is founded upon the principle of "brotherhood", and if this idea be extended from political to industrial and material life we have the germ of the idea now known as socialism. Again, as the parties to the contract are upon a basis of equality, they all participate in that sovereignty which resides within the will of the people. They all, therefore, have the right to be called "citizens". Hence these famous revolutionary terms can be traced directly back to Rousseau. Granting that the *Social Contract* is historically valueless, granting also that it fired the revolutionary conflagration throughout Europe, it none the less performed two positive services which are sometimes overlooked. In the first place, it revived the sentiment of patriotism. The social conditions prevailing in France during and after Rousseau's lifetime were not of the kind calculated to inspire the average person with love for his country, but Rousseau's theory made a man's native land the real centre of existence and an object worthy of struggle and endeavour, and to the energy which his words evoked is partly due the establishment of the Napoleonic empire. In the second place, he secured recognition once and for all of an idea which may seem commonplace to us, but was far from acceptable in his day: the truth that a nation does not consist merely of a king and aristocracy or privileged class, but of the great army of workers whose efforts make life possible and existence tolerable. In other words, he showed that the state should exist, not for the benefit of a privileged few, but in order to improve the conditions of life for every class of its members and especially for the poorest. To the idea of fraternity as introduced by Rousseau might be retraced the many schemes of collective action for the benefit of the community, including, perhaps, even the idea of industrial co-operation which our own century has produced.

A certain headmaster who had emptied his school, quarrelled with his staff, and fought with his governing body is said ultimately to have found a refuge and a livelihood in a professorship of education. The statement is perhaps no more startling than the fact that Rousseau should have written a book upon this subject. He had placed his own children in a foundling hospital; as a tutor he had been a dismal failure; and yet his work, *Emile*, shows extraordinary power of observation of child life and of sympathy with the young. Once again his educational ideas are based upon the theory that man is naturally good, and that social institutions have made him bad; that he must therefore be set free

from social conventions. The subject of education was a burning question at this time, partly because the Jesuits had just been suppressed, whose schools had been the most efficient of the age, partly because an increasing interest was felt in the problems of domestic and family life—an interest which Rousseau had done much to arouse by his other works. People began to understand that education and the acquisition of knowledge are not precisely the same thing, that mothers should nurse their own children, that to separate children from their families entirely was unnatural and disastrous, and, in short, that education was a term comprehending the whole of family life. Rousseau supposes himself the guardian of Émile, an orphan, and proceeds to develop a course of training which is to make this infant a perfect man. Generally speaking, the child is to be taught by the logic of facts. He is not to be saved from falls and tumbles or from the consequences of his own folly, as he will thereby learn more than any previous warnings could teach him. He is to follow his natural inclinations, and only be checked when he demands the services of others or infringes upon their liberty. If he breaks the furniture, he will be punished by feeling the want of it; if he breaks a window, the cold blast will teach him the value of window panes. Punishment is not to be inflicted as punishment, but as a natural consequence of folly or want of self-restraint. Instruction is to be given for practical purposes. Émile, for instance, learned astronomy with his tutor, and enquires, as every pupil brought up on Rousseau's principles should do, What is the use of this? He receives the answer next day when the conscientious tutor takes him for a walk and purposely loses his way in the forest. The day is exhausted in futile efforts to find the road, and at length, at the suggestion of the tutor, Émile applies his astronomical knowledge, and discovers from the position of the sun where they are, and also that their home is on the other side of the nearest hedge. Thus, at the expense of the weary tutor's legs, the lesson was driven home more conscientiously than by Mr. Squeers, but upon principles not wholly dissimilar. These stratagems, however, do not always arise naturally from the course of events, but Émile never seems to discover that they have been prearranged. At the age of twenty he is introduced to Parisian society, and preserved from its snares by the description of the ideal wife, Sophie, presented to him by his tutor. Sophie's introduction is preceded by a long discourse upon the education of girls, the whole object of which, in Rousseau's opinion, is to adapt them to the convenience of men and to make them subservient and helpful. The education of girls is so far precisely the opposite to that of boys, a somewhat remarkable idea in an age when women were extremely prominent in French society, and were often centres of social and political influence. Eventually Sophie appears, and, after two years, the couple are happily married. Unfortunately Rousseau insisted on writing a sequel to the work, in which Sophie is represented as unfaithful, in order, as Rousseau explained, to show how his pupil would behave himself in trying circumstances, and with what manliness he

would extricate himself from his difficulties. The fragment leaves the unfortunate Émile a slave in Algiers, and Rousseau never attempted to finish it. The system of education according to nature is, to some extent, self-contradictory. A continual series of plots, stratagems, and restraints are necessary to prevent the subject from being spoiled. The book, however, exerted a very beneficial influence at the moment. Parents were made to realize that they were responsible for the development of their children, a stimulus was given to methods of teaching, and many pedantic and barbarous methods disappeared. *Sandford and Merton* is a book perhaps little read in England nowadays, but the eminently patient tutor, Mr. Barlow, would probably never have come to life if *Émile* had not been written. Many practical attempts were made upon the Continent to put Rousseau's principles into practice. An eccentric German professor, Basedow, founded a school near Dessau, into which he introduced many of Rousseau's methods, with some lasting results; but the best parts of his teaching were assimilated and spread through Europe by the work of Pestalozzi and Froebel.

An important episode in the *Émile* is the confession of the Savoyard vicar, to which Rousseau was led by consideration of the place which religion should hold in his scheme of education. It was a manifesto both against the orthodox dogmas of the Church and the prevailing philosophical unbelief of the day, and it was for Rousseau a source of calamity. Parliament ordered his book to be burned and the author to be arrested, and this example was followed by the council of Geneva. Rousseau was obliged to leave his protector, the duke of Luxembourg, who gave him timely warning of his danger. He fled to the canton of Bern. There he was again proscribed, and eventually found refuge in Motiers, near Neuchâtel, which at that time belonged to Prussia. Rousseau wrote to Frederick the Great, and also to Keith, the earl marischal, announcing his arrival and requesting permission to remain. Frederick had no reason to admire Rousseau or his writings, but granted his request, and even offered him a pension, which was refused. Here Rousseau compares favourably with Voltaire, who drew his pension from Frederick as long as he could get it, while continually deriding his patron. Rousseau was able to spend some time at Motiers, but his religious enemies gradually raised prejudices against him, the inhabitants of the valley became hostile, stones were thrown at him, the pastor of the village refused to admit him to the communion, and his friends advised him to leave the place. Anxious not to quit Switzerland, he fled to the little island of St. Pierre, on Lake Bienne, where for two months he was extremely happy. "Nothing", he says, "presented itself to me save smiling pictures, nothing recalled saddening memories. The fellowship of the few inhabitants was gentle and obliging, without anything exciting enough to busy me, and, in short, I was free to surrender myself all day to the promptings of my taste or to the most luxurious indolence. As I came out from a long and sweet fit of musing, seeing myself surrounded by verdure, flowers, and



JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

Bust by Jean Antoine Houdon in the Louvre, Paris

It is said that when the news of Rousseau's death reached him, Houdon started at once for Ermenonville and there took a cast of the dead man's face, from which he produced the lifelike head here reproduced.

birds, and letting my eyes wander far over romantic shores that fringed a wide expanse of water bright as crystal, I fitted all these attractive objects to my dreams, and when at last I slowly recovered myself I could not mark the point that cut off dream from reality, so closely did all things unite to endear to me the lonely, retired life that I led in this happy spot. Why can that life not come back to me again, why can I not finish my days in the beloved island, and never see a dweller from the mainland to bring back to my memory all the calamities of every sort that they have delighted in heaping on my head for all these years?"

The island, however, lay within the jurisdiction of the Government of Bern, which gave him orders to quit the territory. His entreaties for permission to remain, even as a state prisoner, were refused. He thought of Berlin, but he feared the climate of north Germany, and was at length persuaded to go to England, where Hume undertook to find him a refuge. As he passed through Paris enormous crowds gathered to see him. In January, 1766, he reached England, to find himself as famous in London as in Paris. The Prince of Wales called upon him, and the theatre was thronged with his admirers. Among these was not included Dr. Johnson, who informed Boswell that he was "a rascal who ought to be hunted out of society". Mr. Davenport, a man of wealth, placed his house at Wootton, in the Derbyshire Peak district, at his disposal; and this Rousseau accepted, though he insisted upon paying £30 a year as board for himself and Thérèse. Troubles began when Hume induced the king to grant his friend a pension. Rousseau was morbidly anxious to avoid obligation to anyone, and at this time there began to rise in his mind suspicions of persecution, wild ideas that some plot against him was in progress, which could hardly be explained except as the outcome of incipient insanity. The air was thick with pamphlets, recriminations, and explanations, with the result that Rousseau was eventually induced to begin his best-known work, his *Confessions*. No autobiography was ever so frank or so self-revealing: he comes before the world naked and unashamed. Few of those with whom he had come in contact escape his suspicions or his animosity. Eventually he resolved to take flight, and made his way to Lincolnshire. In 1767 he returned to France, wandering from place to place, living at poor inns, and finally settling at Paris, where he passed a simple routine life copying music, botanizing, a pursuit which became the absorbing passion of his later years, and writing when he felt inclined. He saw little society, and his suspicious nature made him difficult to manage. Bernardin de St. Pierre saw something of him during those days, and has left a picture of him which is worthy of quotation:

He was thin, of middle height with a brown complexion and a beautiful mouth. The nose well formed and forehead round and high, the eyes full of fire; the oblique lines which fell from his nostrils to the extremities of his mouth gave character to the countenance. One noted in his face three or four characters; melancholy by the hollowness of the eyes and the depression

of the eyebrows, a profound sadness by the wrinkles on the forehead, a lively and even caustic gaiety by the thousand little creases at the exterior corners of the eyes, the orbits of which disappeared when he laughed.

In 1778 he gave up residence in Paris, as he had been offered, by M. de Girardin, a pretty little cottage on his estate, some 20 miles from the capital. His wife had become unfaithful, and embittered his last days. On 2 July of that year he suddenly died. Those responsible for the post-mortem examination gave apoplexy as the cause, but stories of suicide were current, and the truth will probably never be known. His body was buried on the island in the little lake not far from his cottage, until it was disinterred and borne to Paris amid the terror and excitement of the Revolution and placed in the Pantheon.

CHAPTER IV

George Washington (A.D. 1732-1799)


George Washington was born in 1732 at Bridges Creek in Virginia. His family were planters and estate owners as far back as they can be traced. His father died when he was eleven years old, and the boy was left to his mother's influence. She had a family of young children to educate and but slender resources upon which to draw. Her husband was certainly able to leave a landed estate to each of his sons, but land in Virginia at that time was cheap, and represented no great capital value. Mary Washington seems to have been a woman of little education—education, indeed, was scarce in the Virginia of her day—but she was a sensible, strong-minded administrator, with a good deal of business capacity, and she retained the admiration of her brilliant son as long as he lived. Concerning Washington's boyhood practically no authentic facts remain. The story of the axe and the cherry tree and other moral tales of the kind were fathered upon him by a popular writer named Weems, and represent a period of sentimentalism which belongs rather to 1800 than to 1740. The boy obtained a fair education, especially in mathematics, and by the age of seventeen he had fitted himself to be a surveyor. His elder brother, Lawrence, had been educated in England, and in many respects took the place of a second father to George. George also became intimate with a refined and accomplished Englishman, Thomas, Lord Fairfax, who had migrated to America partly in disgust with English society and partly for the purpose of devoting himself to a Virginian estate which he had inherited. Fairfax took a fancy to Washington and gave him one of his earliest commissions, the task of delimitating the boundaries of this estate.

When the struggle between France and England broke out, Washington was naturally involved, as were all frontier settlers, in the war with the Indian-French allies. He followed Braddock in 1755, and was present at the disaster which ended in the death of that disciplinarian and martinet. It was Washington who rallied the troops and enabled them to retreat from the field where they had been beaten by Indians fighting under conditions of Indian warfare. He was given command of the native levies, and struggled desperately to bring some sort of order into his undisciplined force and to inspire them with some sense of patriotism. His reputation as a leader in frontier warfare spread far and wide. He was elected a member of

European History

the Virginia House of Burgesses, and publicly thanked for his services to the country. In 1756 he married and settled at Mount Vernon. He had a deep love of country life, and became one of the most prosperous planters in Virginia, a result only achieved by unremitting attention to the management of his estate. This work, with occasional hunting and fishing, and with such social distractions as the countryside provided, occupied the next few years of his life while events were slowly drawing to the crisis which was to make him prominent.

The Indian war had shown the necessity of maintaining a considerable force in America for the purpose of defending the British Crown Colonies. It was naturally asked whether Britain should bear the whole expense of maintaining this force, which seemed to exist primarily for the benefit of the colonies. Some people asserted that the advantages to Britain far counterbalanced the services rendered to America. Prohibitive legislation had stopped the growth of industries which could compete with those of the mother country, and the colonists were obliged to draw supplies from Britain which they could have manufactured more cheaply themselves or have obtained at lower prices in the markets of the world if free trade had been permitted them. Moreover, the compulsion to trade exclusively with Britain forced them to sell their products at prices even cheaper than those current in European markets, and the flourishing condition of many British industries was due to the cheapness with which they obtained their raw material. Hence it was regarded as unjust to burden the colonies with expenditure necessitated by no action of their own and not likely to bring them any immediate advantage. Undoubtedly the fact that a powerful party in Britain held and maintained these views contributed to the success of the War of Independence. Individual colonies had their own agents at London for the purpose of negotiating special terms for themselves and for watching the progress of public opinion. Thus it was that Benjamin Franklin came to London on behalf of Pennsylvania. The colony most interested in the question was Massachusetts. Boston merchants were entirely dependent upon trade and were anxious to trade with the Spanish colonies, a proceeding forbidden by law as involving losses to the British revenue. On the other hand, Britain felt that the heavy load of debt consequent upon the war with France was a burden which the colonies ought to share, and the method by which money should be raised had been constantly discussed. Several provinces might have been induced to arrange separately with the British Government the amount of the contribution for which they should be liable; and as a matter of fact, whenever an individual colony had been approached for subsidies the request had been readily granted, but the grant seemed to recognize a claim that the colonies should be taxed only with the consent of their representative assemblies. If the Government wished to assert its supremacy by taxation, the only alternatives were to increase the customs duties or to levy some new tax directly upon the colonists.



BIBLE SHOWING THE DATE OF WASHINGTON'S BIRTH



MOUNT VERNON, VIRGINIA: WASHINGTON'S COUNTRY HOUSE, IN WHICH HE DIED

The rooms contain much of the furniture which was in them when occupied by Washington and his family; and both house and estate are preserved as far as possible in the condition in which they were during the lifetime of Washington.


Accordingly Grenville's ministry introduced the Stamp Act in 1755, which was so vigorously boycotted by the colonists that it was repealed two years later. The Government then resolved to raise money by increasing the customs duties and by forced contributions for provisioning the troops in the several garrison towns. This last measure led to open resistance in New York and disturbances at Boston. A further result had been a marked decrease of exports to the mother country, and the consequent injury to British industries induced the Government to repeal the new tariff. The higher duty on tea was, however, retained for the purpose of extorting a form of recognition from the colonies that the Government measures were justified. The result, as everyone knows, was a riot in Boston on 29 December, 1773, when a cargo of tea was thrown overboard. The merchant who had imported it would not venture to discharge the cargo in view of popular intimidation, while the customs officers refused to allow the ships to leave harbour until the duty had been paid. The Government replied by closing the port until the tea had been paid for, and by altering the constitution of the colony. General Gage was given the powers of a military governor and civil administrator for Massachusetts, and it was obvious that the Home Government was prepared to use force.

Virginia was little affected by the new tariffs, but few provinces were more enthusiastic in their support of the Boston Congress. Washington presided over the meeting at which Virginia resolved to join Massachusetts, and then travelled northwards to meet the Congress at Philadelphia. He was fully aware that war was inevitable, and seems to have thought, as few of his contemporaries thought at the time, that violent separation from the mother country could be the only outcome. Already the first shot had been fired between the British and the colonial troops at Lexington, and the British troops were besieged in Boston. Meanwhile the Congress had been joined by all the thirteen states, who were entirely at one upon the question of defending themselves against Britain, divided though they were by local jealousies. In 1775 George Washington was appointed commander-in-chief of the army. Congress established a war fund to which each state was to contribute proportionately. Attempts were made to secure the co-operation of Canada, which was eventually refused, and agents were sent to the various courts of Europe to plead the cause of the colonies. The Congress avoided any declaration of independence, though it acted as an independent power. Washington reached New York shortly after the battle of Bunker's Hill, which, though a victory from a military point of view, brought not the smallest advantage to the British. On 3 July he took command of the first American army, in his own language, "a mixed multitude of people, with very little discipline, order, or government". Officers were elected by their troops, who were composed of raw militia, and made obedience a favour and not a duty. They were totally ignorant of the art of war except so far as skirmishing was concerned, and, while prepared for a short struggle, their patience was worn out by the long siege of

Boston, and they were anxious to return to their homes before any decisive results had been obtained. The provinces were ready to replace them with other men, but these again arrived without experience, and the work of training and exercising them was necessarily begun afresh. That with such material Washington achieved such successes marks him as a commander and organizer of the highest ability. No less arduous were his struggles with the General Congress and the Congress of his province. He had to arrange the organization of supplies and to urge the necessity of gathering resources, to provide ammunition and all the necessities of war, to deal with the prejudices and jealousies of various governors, and to settle quarrels concerning precedence of rank among his officers. At length the British Government resolved no longer to keep its main force confined in Boston, and evacuated the town after a nine months' siege, and Americans were able to enter it.

In May, 1776, Congress met at Philadelphia for the fourth time, and a proposal for separation at length found eager voice. It was difficult to discover how far Congress represented the will of the people. Each state sent as many delegates as it thought desirable. At length, however, a Declaration of Independence was proclaimed on 4 July, a measure taken with some hesitation, but fully justified by results. Meanwhile the British had effected a landing on Long Island, off New York, towards the end of August. Washington and his militia were unable to prevent their movements, and his force was soon out-generalled and out-flanked. The British, however, delayed their final blow, and gave Washington time to effect a brilliant retreat. The British took possession of New York on 15 September, but were finally checked by the Americans at Harlem Heights. Then followed the battle of White Plains, which gave the British control of the country between the Hudson and Long Island, and the Americans were finally obliged to abandon the east side of the Hudson and withdraw into New Jersey. At the end of the year Congress even left Philadelphia under the impression that it would soon be in the hands of the British. Enthusiasm for the war had reached its lowest point. The British general, Howe, proposed an amnesty to the New England states if they would submit, an offer now renewed by the British Parliament to all who were willing to return to their allegiance; proposals were also made for the remedy of grievances. Waverers then went over to the British side, and in September, 1777, the British were able to occupy Philadelphia. Washington's army was melting away, and he had scarcely sufficient men to keep up even the appearance of resistance. At this moment a decisive change of events took place in the north which entirely transformed the situation.

General Burgoyne had advanced from Canada with an army of 8000 men and opened communications with New York, hoping to cut off the northern provinces. The Americans, under General Schuyler, were obliged to retreat, destroying bridges and carrying away supplies.



12662.

George Washington


When Burgoyne had made his way to the Hudson he found that his force was completely exhausted, and an attempt to advance for the purpose of securing supplies ended in a severe defeat. Eventually he and his army were obliged to surrender at Saratoga on 17 October, 1777. The result was that Burgoyne's plan to divide the American forces was not only a complete failure, but that the British garrison in New York was isolated except for communication by sea.

Meanwhile events in America had been attentively watched by France. French statesmen were prepared to seize any opportunity for revenging the loss and humiliation of the Peace of 1763. French agents had even been sent to America to discover what prospects there might be of attacking Britain in her colonies. As soon as the Congress was convinced that separation was inevitable, they naturally applied to France for assistance. After the Declaration of Independence, Washington fitted out privateers, and these were able to take refuge in French harbours, while France gave every facility for the purchase of ships and the enlistment of officers and crews. Benjamin Franklin visited Paris to represent the American cause in the year 1777, but France could not then declare herself. Events seemed to show a possibility of American failure, and little direct assistance was given. One historical figure, however, crossed to America, the youthful Marquis de Lafayette. After Saratoga, France resolved upon the decisive step, and a treaty was concluded with America which amounted to an official recognition of the United States. Early in 1779 Spain and Holland joined the alliance, and Howe was obliged to withdraw his forces from Philadelphia. His successor, Clinton, resolved to transfer the seat of war to the southern provinces. Washington had succeeded in winning some minor successes, and some of his foreign officers had done good service in drilling the army, for which, after long and arduous struggles, Washington had secured a nucleus of permanent regiments. The results of the French alliance at first were very disappointing, and a party in Congress from the outset had regarded French interference with disfavour. The prospects of peace were vague, as France insisted that none of the contracting powers should make peace with Britain without the concurrence of the others; yet, at the same time, Britain was ready to make real concessions for the purpose of ending the American war and devoting her attention to France. Further, the Americans considered that as France was using them for the purpose of her own advantage against Britain, she should bring the war to a conclusion by a large expenditure of money and troops; and France eventually came to the conclusion that they were expected to carry on the war for the benefit of the Americans with French money, French soldiers, and French ships. Amid all these conflicting interests the splendid diplomatic and military talents of Washington stand out pre-eminent. He had the insight requisite to see the facts of any situation in their relative proportions, together with the imperturbable patience which enabled him to await the right moment. He possessed also an extra-

ordinary and contagious energy which inspired all about him with enthusiasm for the cause. He was even more successful in diplomacy than in strategy, and was able to stand between the inexperience and often grasping politicians of the Congress and the diplomatists who had been brought up in the school of Europe. Strained relations were avoided only by the fact that he constantly maintained a control of affairs almost independent of the Congress, while his watchfulness and reserve prevented any accusation of infringing upon their prerogative. Compared with a man like Franklin, Washington's supremacy is obvious. Franklin has the credit of securing the alliance with France; it is impossible to believe that he eventually deceived the allies whom he had done so much to secure, but his frankness and honesty were made a screen by less scrupulous politicians for carrying on negotiations with the British in defiance of treaty obligations. A far-sighted politician he was not, but his common sense and his business capacity proved very valuable assets in the field of diplomacy.

In 1779 the British secured a footing in the south, and in the following year Clinton reduced the fortress of Charleston after a five weeks' siege. Military operations in South Carolina were extremely difficult, as the country was only settled or cultivated upon the coast. Washington, however, who had foreseen this fact and its influence, continued his operations against New York, and compelled Clinton to move northward, while constant skirmishing war continued in the south, which at times rose to the point of an important battle. While the British were able to occupy the coast districts, the Americans could operate undisturbed in the interior of the country. Hence the British resolved to make Virginia the seat of war, a province which provided for the maintenance of the American troops. Even then Washington declined to quit the Hudson, and sent Lafayette to Virginia to hold the British in check. The British commander, Cornwallis, made a fatal mistake in attempting to provide a fortified base at Yorktown, and fell into a trap, which the American leaders at once recognized. He was completely invested by a large force, and on 19 October, 1781, he was obliged to surrender. From this moment the British occupation of the south came practically to an end.

Both sides were now anxious for peace. England was too deeply embarrassed to continue the struggle, for which she could not spare the necessary troops and commanders; while the American allies, France and Spain, began to feel that alliance with America was an expensive luxury. The damage inflicted by the Americans upon English commerce was not sufficient to compensate for their own expenditure in money and troops. Spain, which had long hesitated before taking part in the war, was inclined to regard American affairs as of purely secondary importance, and was only anxious to receive Florida and the Mississippi in return for its services. Washington, moreover, was almost at his wits' end to devise measures for keeping his army together. Pay was in arrears, the national treasury was empty, the states were disinclined to raise taxes, and foreign credit was



G. Washington

GEORGE WASHINGTON

From the painting by G. Stuart in Boston Art Gallery
(Autograph from letter to Congress accepting Presidency)

exhausted. A further source of discontent was the resolution of Congress granting half-pay to officers who should serve until the end of the war. Such appropriations of public money could, however, only be granted upon the concurrence of nine states, which no Congress had ever been able to secure. Only Washington's vigorous personality was able to prevent something like a mutiny, and the wished-for news of peace came as a general relief to all combatants. Congress itself had been greatly divided in the course of the negotiations. Americans were earnestly desirous that Britain should abandon all its claims and possessions in North America. The southern boundary was a cause of discord. It was generally agreed that Spain should receive Florida as a recompense for her services, but, on the other hand, the southern states were anxious to retain the right of free navigation down the Mississippi. The northern states, again, were anxious that Britain should guarantee their rights to a share of the Newfoundland fisheries, and northern and southern parties wrangled concerning the precedence which these claims should take. Samuel Adams and other leaders of the northern party spoke and acted as if their states had borne the whole burden of the war, in spite of the fact that privateering operations upon British merchant ships had been as profitable as the unpatriotic business of furnishing provisions for the British in Halifax and even in New York. At times the tension reached such a pitch that the new union of thirteen states was threatened with disruption. Washington's efforts, however, supported by those of Franklin and of the party of French representatives, succeeded in avoiding any direct expression of opinion upon points where interest was irreconcilable. The British politicians, moreover, were anxious to conciliate public opinion in the United States, and showed great readiness to make concessions. France was never officially informed by the Americans that negotiations were in progress, although French diplomatists must have been aware of the fact; but this breach of diplomatic practice did not, in the long run, offend the interests of France. Eventually, on 3 September, 1783, the Peace was ratified at Versailles, when the thirteen United States of North America were recognized as independent. Participation in the Newfoundland fisheries, and, indeed, all other stipulations made by the Americans, were conceded, while a treaty of commerce was to be concluded between Britain and the United States in order to restore the relations interrupted by war. It now remained for the newly recognized country to evolve a constitution.

This was no easy matter; apart from the fact that the United States were divided into northern and southern groups, petty jealousies and local interests also made for separatism; nor had Congress ever been constituted upon a legal basis. It was a makeshift assembly with authority as yet undefined; and if that authority had never met with any serious resistance the force of circumstances rather than the energy of the Congress accounted for the fact. Washington was well aware that certain points were indispensable to the existence of the United States as an independent power, and he discoursed

eloquently upon the four pillars of national liberty. There must be an indissoluble union of the states under one federal head, full acceptance of the obligations incurred by Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war, the adoption of a system which should place the militia upon a regular and efficient footing, and a readiness to forget local prejudices and policies, and to sacrifice individual advantages to the interests of the community. Washington then resigned his command of the army, and returned to repose on his estate at Mount Vernon. There he spent his time in country pursuits and in repairing the neglect which his property had undergone during the war. At the same time he kept a careful eye upon public affairs, and saw with regret that a federation which had contrived to work when bound together by the pressure of public danger was daily proving more incompetent to act as a national government. The arrangements for restoring the national credit and evolving a system of finance roused a considerable amount of opposition, and at length, largely upon Washington's initiative, it was resolved that delegates from all the states should meet at Philadelphia and should revise the federal system. Their proceedings were to be subsequently submitted to Congress for approval and confirmation. Washington himself accepted the position of delegate with some reluctance, but with characteristic energy began to read constitutional history in order to prepare his mind for a consideration of the subject. The convention comprised fifty-five delegates, representing twelve states, and at the first sitting Washington was elected president. The fact that he was able to induce an assembly representing so many and such heterogeneous interests to agree upon a final form of constitution reflects the utmost credit upon his statesmanship and his diplomatic powers.

The constitution of the United States was the outcome of mutual concessions inspired by a desire for the common welfare which Washington kept steadily in view. The knowledge also possessed by the convention that their deliberations would not be binding until the states had approved them, gave them greater boldness than they would otherwise have felt. Great questions, indeed, were involved; there was the question of representation in proportion to population. When the southern states wished negroes to be included in the census, they were persuaded to be content with considering five negroes as equivalent to three white men. There was the question of the slave trade, in which Washington had been brought up, and upon which he held strong views. There was also the question of the executive power. Antimonarchical as were the feelings of the convention, there was, none the less, an opinion that a single person should be placed at the head of the Government, and the manner in which his election should be achieved gave rise to endless discussion which more than once endangered the whole work of the convention.

At length, on 20 September, 1787, Washington was able to lay the work of the convention before Congress. The Federal party

carried their proposal that the states should decide upon it without change. By the old articles the consent of every state was necessary before a new form could be established, therefore it was provided that the ratification of nine states only should be sufficient to bring the new constitution into force. By the end of 1788 a sufficient number of states had ratified the proposals, and arrangements were therefore made for the presidential election on 7 January, 1789.

The general opinion expressed by the nation was that Washington should be the first to occupy the presidential chair. He was very reluctant to accept office, but none the less was persuaded to undertake it for the first four years. His progress to Washington was a triumphal procession, and one which he could readily contrast with the weary marchings and counter marchings which he had undergone through the same country during the course of the war. The United States were extremely fortunate in their choice. Washington was the only man who combined an unselfish patriotism and a firm faith in the country's future with wide experience, diplomatic power and tact, and statesmanlike insight. Throughout the war he had been independent of party, and was anxious now to adopt a neutral position. Insensibly, however, he was drawn into the leadership of the Federalist party. The most urgent task before the new Government was the restoration of United States credit at home and abroad. Alexander Hamilton, his authority on finance, proposed to fund the debt of the United States, while the debts of separate states were to be taken over by the Union, an operation which rich northern merchants unpatriotically turned to their own advantage by buying up the bonds issued by several states and getting them redeemed at par by the Government. For these operations money was needed, and Hamilton proposed to raise it by a tax which would at least have reminded every member of his connection with the Union. This measure produced an unexpected outburst of wrath; in Pennsylvania and North Carolina, especially, angry frontiersmen declined to obey the law. Officials were ill treated in the attempt to execute their duty, and Washington was obliged to call out the militia to crush what was practically a revolt. The turbulent elements, who were under the impression that they were dealing with a petty local Government, soon discovered their mistake when 15,000 troops were called out against them, and the so-called Whisky Rebellion speedily collapsed. Again Washington had proved his statesmanship; he gave the offenders every latitude, and waited until he felt that public opinion was behind him. His action justified the existence of the United States Republic, because it proved that the republic was able to keep order. The rebellion in itself may have been a small and unimportant rising, but greater men and apparently stronger governments than Washington's have been overthrown by such trifles.

Washington's foreign policy also displayed brilliant insight. The French Revolution had broken out, and was naturally hailed in America with the utmost delight. It was felt that the glorious example of the

European History


United States was about to be followed in Europe, that monarchies and despots were to disappear, and that a new and golden age was about to begin for the whole world—a natural delusion for men who never understood the profound racial differences between the Romance and English-speaking races. The southern states were completely carried away by the sonorous phrases of French republicans, and were ready to give them every aid in their struggle against their despots. But Washington well knew that the new and unformed state could not afford to involve itself in any desperate venture of the kind. Such action would, to begin with, have interrupted the renewed commercial connections with England, connections which France could do nothing to replace. Washington therefore insisted upon the strictest neutrality. French republicans ignored his declaration; soldiers were enlisted, and privateers were fitted out in American towns, and the French ambassador was enthusiastically received in the south and even in New York. But Washington maintained so careful an attitude that the most zealous supporter of France was unable to take offence; and when war broke out between Britain and France, he did his utmost to keep the state free from European complications. Europe was informed that the new power took no interest in the fate of the old dynasties, and was concerned only with the conquest and the mastery of its own continent. This was an idea that eventually crystallized into the well-known Monroe doctrine. When the minister of the French Republic attempted to defy the United States upon the question of French privateers, Washington, with perfect firmness, asserted his authority, and maintained the dignity of his country, and in spite of much wrangling and opposition he secured the support of the nation.

Washington's foreign policy with Britain after the conclusion of the peace was again marked by statesmanlike decision and firmness. At the time when the so-called Whisky War seemed imminent, when the struggles with the Indians were yet in progress, an additional source of grievance was provided by those British measures which hampered American commerce. Congress seemed inclined to propose reprisals which would make war inevitable. Washington then announced that he had appointed one of the Federalist leaders, Mr. Jay, as extraordinary ambassador to the court of London, for the purpose of settling the differences between the two nations by negotiation. The treaty eventually concluded was not entirely satisfactory even to the most statesmanlike thinkers in America. It did, however, put an end to the cases immediately in dispute, and was a sufficient assurance against an outbreak of war. These were the principal points which Washington had at heart, and he therefore accepted it. But a strong current of opposition ran through many parts of America. In Philadelphia, for instance, the treaty was solemnly burnt before the house of the English consul. Washington resolved upon strong measures, and at once ratified the treaty, for which the approval of Congress was then required. A desperate

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL TO THE ARMY. From the painting by Andrew C. Gow, R.A. By permission of the Berlin Photographic Company.

The scene is thus described by Thackeray in *The Virginians*: “ His battles over, his country freed, his great work of liberation complete, the General laid down his victorious sword, and met his comrades of the army in a last adieu. . . . A barge was in waiting at the Whitehall Ferry to convey him across the Hudson. . . . A line of infantry was formed from the tavern to the ferry, and the General with his officers following him, walked silently to the water.” Washington is shaking hands with his favourite general, Knox, and the other generals shown are Steuben, Sumter, Nathaniel Greene, Wayne, Gates, Moultrie, Marion, and Putnam. The officer in green faced with red immediately behind Knox is Alexander Hamilton, the maker of the United States constitution.

Andrew Carrick Gow, the painter, was born in London in 1848, and became a Royal Academician in 1891. His works are almost all historical pictures.



WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL TO THE ARMY

ANDREW C. GOW, R.A.



struggle went on for six weeks, and at length the opposition realized that the president was inflexible, and approved his decision by a majority of only three. Party spirit passed all bounds of reason, Washington was charged with scandalous practices, was exposed to threats and invectives, and was troubled with constant anonymous letters. He said himself that the language used of him would hardly have been applicable to a Nero, a notorious criminal, or a vulgar pick-pocket. But when the public had time to reflect upon the situation it began to realize that Washington had been right, and that America at that juncture could not afford to retard her development by another war. There was a general feeling that Washington should be asked to hold the presidency for a third term of office.

His mind, however, was made up. He looked forward to the conclusion of his presidency with a sense of great relief. In his farewell address he warned the people against the excesses of party spirit, which he saw was a weakness of the Government. Washington himself had been a party man; his idea undoubtedly was that the president should be the representative of the whole people and above and beyond party, but by the end of his term of office he had grown convinced that party government could not be avoided under the existing constitution. He was naturally opposed to the party which had resisted the many achievements of his administration, nor could he avoid regarding them as political enemies. This was the party which considered the interests of France as the leading issue in American politics, and was ready to toy with questions of separatism. Washington, on the other hand, was an American and a Nationalist, and consequently in the Federalist party he found his support. As soon as he had resigned office, and could speak freely, his partisanship—a better term, perhaps, is his patriotism—became clearly pronounced.

It was time for him to resign. He had assumed office at a difficult and critical moment, he had maintained the independence of his country and had founded a system of free government, and he could withdraw in full consciousness of victory. Eight years is a long period in the life of a growing state, and an opposition party had been gradually rising. His successor, Adams, who was in full agreement with Washington's principles, was followed by Jefferson, a representative of the democratic ideas which prevailed for many years to come. Washington's retirement took place amid an outburst of enthusiasm in which his successor was forgotten. He retired to Mount Vernon, from which he had been absent eight years, and devoted himself to the improvement of his property. He continued to take a keen interest in public affairs, and when friction arose with France, and roused a cry of indignation throughout Europe in 1798, Washington acceded to the request that he would resume command of the army. He stipulated, however, that he should not be called into active service unless hostilities broke out, while he was also to have the appointment of the general staff—a question upon which some difference of opinion arose between himself and the new president, though Washington, as usual, had his

y. He was tolerably certain from the outset that there was no great danger of actual war. But he devoted an enormous amount of time and thought to the organization of the army, in the belief that preparation for war is the best means of preserving peace. That he should have been thus willing to abandon his well-earned rest is a signal instance of his patriotism. For the principles and doctrines of the French Revolution, Washington had a profound hatred. The opposition party in Congress was infected by the new doctrines, though America might be thought to have been far beyond the reach of any such infection. When Washington found a party in the United States devoted to France, and fanatically preaching revolutionary ideas, he realized that not only the existence of the Union, but the very foundations of society, were endangered. He gave his approval of the Alien and Sedition Acts, which were intended to check the influence of dangerous agitators, and which were characterized by many as undue infringements upon the freedom of the citizen. Most of all did he regret the fact that his own Federal party was divided among itself in consequence. Amid these anxieties his death suddenly occurred at the end of 1799. He succumbed to an attack of laryngitis, which the medical science of his day had not learned how to treat.

Washington is a man who stands apart. By birth he was an aristocrat, of manners stately and formal, but entirely superior to social prejudice. Virginian aristocracy, based upon the foundation of slavery, was often proud and exclusive; and when Washington had to deal with troops who elected and deposed their officers, who left their duty and went home when they felt inclined, and whose manners were often democratically rough, his sense of order and discipline was rudely disturbed. Yet he succeeded in making these troops entirely devoted to himself by studying their manners and their prejudices instead of condemning them by comparison with his own. Physically he was a powerful man, 6 feet 2 inches in height, with enormous hands and feet, and capable of lifting weights which tried two men of ordinary strength. He was an excellent judge of men, and knew exactly how much might be expected of them and with what responsibilities they might be entrusted. Fully conscious of the defects in his own education, he was ever ready to support any scheme intended to make education more efficient. Like most great men he had also a genius for detail. Before the revolution a discussion took place in his own district concerning a proper site for a church. Two parties were warmly opposed upon the question, each asserting that the site of their preference was most convenient for the majority of the parishioners. At the final meeting Washington carried his view by means of a carefully prepared collection of statistics showing the exact distance of each parishioner's house from the proposed site. The story is characteristic of the close attention which he gave to every question with which he had to deal. At the same time he never lost sight of the great and ultimate object for which he was working, however deeply he was involved in the minor questions of the moment. His great purpose

was to build up a new and independent nation, and his last words, which the world did not hear until after his death, were a plea that the younger generation might be so trained that all could think as Americans, uninfluenced by foreign ideas or local prejudices. The impelling force of his career was his firm faith in the future of his country, a conception in his day only possible to a powerful man, able to rise above existing conditions and gaze with the eyes of faith upon the distant future.

CHAPTER V

Talleyrand (A.D. 1754-1838)

Charles Maurice Talleyrand was born on 13 February, 1754. His father, an officer in the army, was a figure of some small reputation at court. High society was not inclined to be troubled with the care of young children in those days—Rousseau had not begun to preach the return to nature and the responsibility of parentage; the child was handed over to the care of a nurse for the first four years of his life. The death of a brother had left him the eldest of the family, but the military career for which he had been intended was cut short by a fall during his childhood, which made him lame for life. As he could not enter the army it was resolved that he should enter the Church, and in 1762 he was sent to school in Paris. Four years later he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice. He showed not the least taste for a clerical life, and neither the lives of Cardinals Retz or Richelieu, nor the splendours of Rheims, where his uncle held a high ecclesiastical position, were able to reconcile him to the proposed career. He read continually, but learned more from life than from books. He would always argue with an author, and was never to be crushed by any ready-made assertion. Rousseau, for instance, had no influence over him; he could not understand the indignation of an upstart against society, nor was he to be dazzled by any rhetoric. There was also in Talleyrand a certain cynicism, often perhaps shallow and trifling, which made him wholly unamenable to Rousseau's outbursts of sentiment. By 1775 he was a priest, and in that year he witnessed the coronation of Louis XVI at Rheims. He had powerful friends, and it seemed likely that he would rise high.

The clergy, since the meeting of the States-General in 1614, had, alone of the estates of the realm, preserved their representative institutions. They regarded themselves as the equals of the crown, and, though the king retained the right of appointment to certain bishopries and benefices, the clergy demanded increased privileges and the strengthening of the laws against heretics. The clergy as a whole were controlled by two agents-general who performed functions something like those of a modern minister of public worship, and generally acted as intermediaries between the clergy and the Government. Their office was no sinecure when a general attack was made upon the claim of the clergy to exemption from taxation. The history of the French Church in the eighteenth century is the history of attempts to over-

throw opposition by timely concessions and to withdraw those concessions so soon as they were made.

Talleyrand's first appearance in society was made in Paris in one of the salons of the day. He was given the benefice of St. Denis at Rheims, and was henceforward known as the Abbé Périgord; he had rooms in Paris, collected books, went much into society, and was invited everywhere. People began to listen to him. Some definite attitude was necessary if he was to make his mark, and he proceeded to publish his contempt and dislike of the minister Necker. Necker was attempting to bring some order into the fearful confusion of French finance. The revolt of the American colonies against England had roused French enthusiasm. The loss of Canada, defeats in India and upon the seas, had deeply lowered French prestige, and it was thought that a blow struck against England in America might enable France to recover much lost ground. Necker warned the public that war was impossible with an empty treasury, but they would not listen to him, and Talleyrand saw many men of his own rank and standing set sail for the American continent. Talleyrand viewed these proceedings with much indifference, and writes upon them with characteristic cynicism:

The grand gentlemen of my young days had one characteristic: they thought that they had discovered, and they consequently valued the more highly, everything that was new to them. "Where should we be without America?" was to be heard on all sides. "It procures us a navy," said one; "it extends our commerce," said another; "it provides for our surplus population," said the administrators; "it is an outlet for our turbulent spirits," said the ministers; "it is a refuge for all our nonconformists," said the philosophers.

Talleyrand seems even then to have conceived the leading lines of his future policy—peace with England, who was to be left to her colonizing work, and supremacy in the Mediterranean for France. In 1783 he made the acquaintance of Pitt, who was then learning French, and in the same year he had some share in the negotiations which led to an eventual commercial treaty with England in 1786. He had already been appointed agent-general for the clergy in 1780, and soon came to the conclusion that the constant attacks upon his order were undermining its influence upon the nation, and that some pecuniary sacrifice was necessary to restore its prestige. He proposed, for instance, to raise the salaries of the parochial clergy, who were often hopelessly underpaid, and were sometimes obliged to wrest their tithes out of peasants far more wretched than themselves. No doubt, if Talleyrand's advice had been taken, the lower ranks of the clergy might have been conciliated, and in 1789 the Government would not have been disappointed in its expectations of their support.

Talleyrand by birth and upbringing was a member of the old régime. Abuses political and social were undoubtedly rampant. The authority of the crown and of the Bourbons was intolerably oppressive, and, as Turgot wrote in his celebrated memorial to the king: "All evils

arise from the absence in France of any constitution". Necker again spoke of the constitution as one, "wherein no public power can find either the beginning of its rights or the limits of its authority". The few customs which might have restrained the arbitrary power of the crown were, for the most part, obsolete or had been made null and void. The States-General, composed of the clergy and nobles, and the three estates of the realm, which had at one time been consulted upon questions of taxation and legislation, had never been convoked since 1614. Both taxation and the administration of justice were entirely in the hands of the king, who might pronounce arbitrary judgment in any suit, or imprison in the Bastille without trial the most famous and the meanest of his subjects. Taxation weighed most heavily upon the poor, as every person with any pretensions to nobility claimed exemption. The taxes were collected upon so corrupt a system that little more than two-thirds of them ever reached the royal treasury, and of these a large proportion was absorbed in maintaining the outward show of court life. The French nobility consisted of some twenty or thirty thousand families, who, though stripped of their ancient power, clung tenaciously to their rights of exemption. The evils of absentee landlordism were conspicuous in their most glaring forms. The majority of the nobles lived in Paris, or at Versailles, supplementing the king's bounty by taxes wrung from their wretched peasantry. The principal clergy held one-third of the lands of France, an immense property almost wholly exempt from taxation. A definite line of demarcation separated them from the lower clergy, who were, for the most part, humble parish priests, often drawn from the peasant class and constantly sharing their poverty. With that class they were naturally in sympathy, a class which formed the majority of the third estate of the realm. The most intelligent and capable element in the French nation were the middle classes, then comparatively small in numbers, and composed of merchants, lawyers, and other professional men. The peasantry had been emancipated from their condition of serfdom long before, but the majority of them were obliged to pay some dues in service or in kind to their feudal overlord, and the restrictions laid upon agriculture for the preservation of game increased their poverty, which might become starvation upon the failure of the crops. Above this mass of discontent the nobility maintained an attitude of resolute optimism, supported by profound ignorance; and when a princess of France heard that the peasants in a certain district were starving for want of bread, she is said to have enquired sympathetically: "Why cannot they put up with piecrust?"

There were, however, both nobles and higher clergy who were notable exceptions to the general spirit of selfishness, and on the eve of the Revolution the condition of the French peasantry was, in many cases, superior to that of the peasants in many parts of Europe. It is not in their suffering that the ultimate cause of the Revolution is to be found. As in England and also in America, the spirit of

THE OATH OF THE TENNIS COURT,
20th JUNE, 1789. From a painting by Auguste
Couder in the Palace of Versailles.

The Oath of the Tennis Court is a celebrated incident in the early days of the great revolution. The momentous States General met at Versailles on 4th May; on 17th June the Third Estate declared itself a National Assembly, thereby making a complete breach with the past and proclaiming a new régime. The king resolved to hold a "royal session", and placards were posted by ministers in the Salle des Menus Plaisirs announcing the royal session for 22nd June. The deputies of the Third Estate, with Bailly at their head, found the hall closed against them on 20th June, and adjourned to a neighbouring tennis court, where they took a solemn oath not to separate until a constitution had been established.

Louis Charles Auguste Couder (1789-1873), the painter of this picture, is known chiefly by his historical and mythological paintings. The date of this picture is 1848.

L. C. A. COUDER

THE OATH OF THE TENNIS COURT, JUNE 29, 1789



enlightenment and the fact that people had learnt to think were the real causes of the upheaval; and the ultimate source of this enlightenment may be traced to England. Montesquieu, Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, and the rest did little more than popularize the lessons of political liberty and of philosophy which were first developed in England. Sir Isaac Newton, Locke, Shaftesbury, and Bolingbroke began the teaching which ended in a sceptical philosophy creating discontent with the established order of Church and State and raising an uncontrollable desire for change. Equally potent was the influence of the American revolution. The republican simplicity of the new state formed the strongest contrast to the artificial extravagance of the French court. Those Frenchmen who placed their swords at the service of America found themselves transported to an environment which seemed to their superficial gaze to resemble the idealist dreams of Rousseau or Fénelon, and the inference was natural that if Utopia had been realized in the West it might also be founded in the East. Meanwhile the state plunged more deeply into bankruptcy; the rigidity of court etiquette and the selfishness of the upper classes forbade the introduction of any reforms likely to check the swelling totals of the national debt. The people naturally ascribed these difficulties to court extravagance and particularly to that of the queen, who was known as Madame Deficit. A council of notables, summoned in 1787, declined to make any concessions, and in 1788 the king resolved to call together the almost-forgotten States-General, which eventually met upon the memorable date of 5 May, 1789.

Meanwhile Talleyrand had become bishop of Autun. He was also a member of the provincial assembly of his own province, the Burgundian estates, and was elected by the clergy as a delegate when the States-General was called. The third estate demanded that voting should be by counting of heads and not by each estate of the realm in isolation; eventually they constituted themselves the National Assembly and invited the other orders to join their deliberations, informing them that they intended in any case to proceed with business. There followed the famous Oath of the Tennis Court, when they bound themselves not to separate until they had formed a constitution for France. The third estate then met in one of the churches of Versailles, and were joined by a few nobles and a considerable number of the clerical deputies. Talleyrand was not among the first of these, but he was well aware of the critical nature of the situation. So deep was his anxiety that with three or four friends he made a night expedition to Marly to request an audience of the king. The king preferred to be represented by the Comte d'Artois, to whom Talleyrand explained that the only hope of saving the country was to dissolve the present assembly and to convoke another under a different elective system. If the royal power were cleverly used, much might be saved, but continued attempts to oppose the popular choice would only end in disaster. Talleyrand's suggestions were not well received, and he came to the conclusion that it was time for him to think of himself. On 26 June

he joined the third estate, and made no further attempts to come to an understanding with the court. In conjunction with Mirabeau he headed the movements of the Assembly, with the hope and object of keeping the Revolution within bounds. He had, moreover, a very considerable bribe to offer to the Revolution, the destruction of the Gallican Church.

While the National Assembly was thus preparing for the fray, the Government of Paris was undergoing a similar revolution. Then was formed the municipal council, which eventually overshadowed the power of the National Assembly itself. The celebrated National Guards were organized, and on 14 July came the storming of the Bastille, and Louis XVI was informed that the Revolution had begun. This act was followed by disturbances throughout the provinces, and the privileged orders began to realize that they must surrender some of their feudal rights. An example was set in the National Assembly by two young nobles, who were enthusiastically followed by many others. The Assembly resolved that a statue should be erected to Louis XVI as "the restorer of French liberty". No more unsuitable inscription could have been devised, but the fact is enough to show that the influence of the crown was still strong enough to prove useful had there been wisdom and foresight to guide it.

Talleyrand was made a member of the committee for the preparation of a constitution, a committee chosen by the Assembly of 14 July, and shortly afterwards he proposed to secularize the Church property. Tithes were to be abolished on the understanding that some other provision should be made for religious purposes. For this object Talleyrand drew up a scheme. Enormous as was the property of the Church, he was well aware that a sudden sale of land would cause a considerable fall in values, as indeed actually occurred. He justified his legal position by the argument that Church endowments were made for the benefit of the whole community and not for a particular order within it. By 12 October his views were carried, and the whole estate of the clergy was declared the property of the nation. His devotion to the cause secured him the presidential chair in the Assembly, a chair held after him by Mirabeau, and he was largely responsible for the Declaration of the Rights of Man, a document drawn up in imitation of the American "Declaration of Rights". In the invasion of Versailles by the mob, and the transfer of the royal family to Paris, Talleyrand was naturally not concerned, but they were events which could have caused him no surprise. He was at work upon the civil constitution of the clergy. France was redivided into departments, which were at the same time bishoprics, and all clergy were required to take an oath of allegiance to the new constitution. Talleyrand was also interested in financial affairs. As he had foreseen, the Assembly found it impossible to sell so vast an amount of real estate as the Church lands at a fair price, and therefore issued currency notes, called assignats, security for which was the nationalized land. As Talleyrand pointed out from the first,

inflation was bound to occur, and further issues of notes continued until the assignats became quite worthless. The conversion of the Church also ended in disturbances; only four bishops would take the oath, and a large section of the clergy became bitter opponents of the Revolution. The Assembly certainly passed a decree allowing non-juring priests to exercise their religious functions, but it speedily became a dead letter. Such priests were soon subjected to open persecution, and Talleyrand himself delivered another blow to the Church by depriving it of its educational functions: instruction was henceforward to be secularized and taken out of the hands of the clergy, who had hitherto controlled it.

The king's attempted flight from the kingdom was stopped at Varennes. An emigration of the nobles had taken place upon a large scale, and the exiles beyond the frontier were unwilling to make any move which might endanger the safety of the royal family. If, therefore, the king could escape beyond the frontiers he might place himself at their head, and with the help of some foreign power strike a blow for his crown. The emigration of the nobles and the attempted flight of the king sealed the death warrant of monarchy in France. The king was no longer trusted, and republicanism began to raise its head. At the end of September, 1791, the National Assembly adjourned after a two years' session. The new constitution, which made France a constitutional monarchy, had been already ratified by the king, and the members of the Assembly had disqualified themselves from seeking election to the three following Assemblies.

Questions of foreign policy were now becoming most urgent. It was not clearly known what support the crown might expect to find abroad, and Talleyrand's next important work was a mission to London. He speedily perceived that any hopes of securing English support were futile. Burke had already roused public opinion by declaring that any comparison between the French and English revolutions was an insult to his country. Talleyrand would have been content with a declaration of neutrality, but Lord Grenville, with whom he discussed the subject, declined to open negotiations with a person who had no power to treat. Talleyrand was also exposed to a series of vigorous attacks in the English press, inspired from Paris, and by the time he was recalled to his own country it was clear that a further stay in London would have been a waste of time. A second visit proved more profitable, and British neutrality was promised upon terms which, if not wholly satisfactory, were better than nothing; so much was gained by Talleyrand's diplomacy, in which he occasionally exceeded his instructions. But when he returned to Paris he found that the real master of the situation was Danton, and he must have felt that the recently extorted declaration was not likely to last long. The Legislative Assembly had declared war upon Austria; the duke of Brunswick won several victories and advanced towards Paris. On 10 August, 1792, the one powerful body in France was the commune. The palace of the Tuileries was sacked, and the September massacres

followed. For the third time Talleyrand visited London, and for the third time upon a diplomatic mission. Many of his friends had been massacred or had taken flight, and, as he says himself, after the crime of 10 August his one idea was to get out of France. He reached London on 23 September, three days after the victory of Valmy, the meeting of the National Assembly in Paris, and the declaration of the republic. With the retirement of Danton, Talleyrand's commission disappeared, and he was able to deny in London that he had any official purpose to fulfil. He was an admirer of English constitutionalism, but he was no less an admirer of law and order. From 1792 to 1796 he remained in exile.

No sooner had he left the country than the decree of the Convention placed him on the list of *émigrés*, and he had thus further reason to congratulate himself upon escaping the guillotine. While France was reforming her constitution and executing her king, while the Girondins were overthrown and the Reign of Terror proceeded amid attempts to abolish Christianity and erect the worship of the goddess of reason, Talleyrand was living in London, sharing what little money he had, the proceeds of the sale of his library, with his friends in misfortune. The *émigrés* upon the Rhine devoted their energies to conspiracy and sought distraction in social entertainments. Those in England lived a quiet and unostentatious life; and the clergy among them particularly secured the esteem of their hosts. Many middle-class English families then chose a French abbé to teach his language to their children; some of them started small businesses and used the proceeds to help their older and weaker brethren. Women of the highest rank worked at any occupation they could find, to get bread for their children, and the only blot upon their conduct was their continual quarrels with one another. Political shortsightedness was remarkable for its prevalence; many of them would have scorned to take rooms for more than three months, in the expectation of a speedy recall to their own country. Talleyrand was not one of these. No one was more anxious than he to return to France, but he did not waste his time in vain regrets. He was not, however, able to stay in England; Pitt enforced against him the measures of the Alien Bill, and on 3 February, 1794, he set sail for America. He bore letters of introduction from Lord Lansdowne to Washington; but the president regretted that political reasons forbade him to receive Talleyrand. Washington was then doing his best to steer clear of any entanglement with France. Talleyrand, however, was able to meet Alexander Hamilton, the greatest of Washington's subordinates. He and Talleyrand had much in common. Both had undertaken the task of framing a constitution, and both had been specially occupied with finance and education. Hamilton succeeded where Talleyrand had failed, and his realization of Mirabeau's idea, a state constituted upon federal lines, with a president to represent the secular power, must have been perfectly familiar to Talleyrand. He saw a certain monarchical element in the constitution with which he was entirely in sympathy. At the same time he was



TALLEYRAND

(Charles Maurice, duc de Talleyrand-Périgord)

From the picture at Versailles after Gérard

by no means happy in Philadelphia; like many others, he regarded the years immediately before the Revolution as the happiest in the world, and a large element in that contentment was provided by talk and conversation, which had become a fine art. There was nothing in America even remotely resembling the brilliant salons of the French aristocracy. Washington's Puritan friends were to Talleyrand so many consummate bores, and will suffice to account for his ill-tempered exclamation: "What is a democracy but an aristocracy of blackguards!" He travelled also in the woods of the Far West, and attempted to improve his financial position by speculation. He expended such money as he had saved from the wreck of his fortunes in fitting out a merchantman, and had just completed this work when he received news, in November, 1795, that the decree of the Convention against him had been revoked. By January, 1796, he was in Hamburg, but for more than a year he remained outside the frontiers of his native land.

The constitution of the Directory provided a sufficient reason for further absence. The qualification for membership in the Directory was regicide, and the new form of government appeared to be nothing more than the Convention in concentrated form. Liberty of worship was again abolished; religious persecution and the proscription of *émigrés* recommenced, and Talleyrand resolved to wait at Hamburg until the sky cleared. The change came when Napoleon began to make a name for himself by his brilliant victories in Italy. Bonaparte's reception in Paris showed that he was the man of the hour; Talleyrand felt that it was safe for him to return, and re-entered Paris in 1796 after an absence of four years. He seemed to be entering a new world: palaces had become barracks or taverns, churches were warehouses or stables. Grass grew in the streets of quarters once fashionable, and he himself seemed to be forgotten. He was in considerable financial straits, which were relieved by a friend, and eventually he was appointed minister for foreign affairs at the instance of Barras, a member of the Directory, who had a high regard for him. Some members of the Directory were bitterly opposed to the appointment: he was spoken of as a renegade priest; a traitor to his order, his king, and his God; as a man who changed his principles as readily as his linen, and who was quite capable of betraying the whole of the Directory. When he took office all salaries were in arrears; he could not pay the wages of his servants, and was obliged to use valuable Sèvres china plates, as there was no money to buy cheaper earthenware. Talleyrand ingratiated himself with Napoleon by correspondence, and Napoleon fell completely under his personal charm at their first meeting. His schemes for his Egyptian campaign were all confided to Talleyrand, who recognized his own policy in the proposal for making the Mediterranean a French lake. It was arranged that he should proceed to Constantinople as French ambassador, to soothe the mind of the Porte when the campaign against the Mamelukes had been begun. But he never started, probably because he felt that his mission would have been useless. For

the Government of which he was a member he had the profoundest contempt. Their vulgar attempts to ape the grand manners of the aristocracy, their extravagance in dress, gave the reception rooms of the Directory the appearance of a fancy-dress ball. Talleyrand, whatever his faults, was an aristocrat by birth and upbringing, and was always anxious to observe the outward decencies of behaviour. When the apostles of the new religion submitted to the Institute, of which Talleyrand had been a member before the Revolution, a new confession of faith, urging the commemoration of the three great acts of life—birth, marriage, and death—Talleyrand characteristically replied that he had only one observation to offer: Jesus Christ, in order to found His religion, had been crucified and had risen from the dead; and he advised the founder of this new religion to act like Him.

Feeling no certainty upon the permanency of such a regime, Talleyrand resolved to enrich himself while he could. Under a treaty with Portugal a payment of eight millions was made, of which he is said to have kept three for himself. He never, however, made any secret of his intentions to accumulate resources for the future, and this is the only excuse for his dishonesty. He regarded his diplomatic services as constituting a fair claim for payment, and estimated the remuneration due upon principles of his own. "Proud as a peacock, and venal as a footman, he neither says what he does nor does what he says", was the judgment passed upon him by the Prussian minister of legation. He often tried to make money out of America when friction arose between the Directory and Washington's Government. He offered to cede Ceylon and the Cape to England if Pitt would provide a sum of two millions for division among himself and his friends. The most that can be said for him is that he was no worse than many others.

In 1799 Talleyrand resigned his post under the Directory. It was a Government which had fallen into popular disfavour. The populace feared a royalist invasion, and the Directory were afraid that another Reign of Terror would break out; it is more than a coincidence that Talleyrand resigned his post at this critical time. How far he was concerned with the sudden return of Bonaparte to France may never be known, but he certainly negotiated the understanding between Sieyès and Bonaparte which ended in the *coup d'état* of Brumaire, 1799. A few days afterwards the First Consul publicly thanked him and others for their co-operation. With the exception of the Jacobins, everybody welcomed the substitution of arbitrary for constitutional power. There was some hope of peace both at home and abroad, and Talleyrand's reappointment to the ministry of foreign affairs soon followed. He was indispensable in this position to Bonaparte, who was well aware of the fact, and the years immediately succeeding the consulate fulfilled Talleyrand's expectations of the change. Napoleon left the purchasers of national property in possession of their new acquisitions, he disturbed no institutions of the Revolution that showed any signs of permanency,

Talleyrand


and he enabled a large number of the huge list of *émigrés* to return to the country. Talleyrand had a sincere admiration for him, and bore with the exacting demands which his service required. Napoleon's ideal of government was to have all the threads in his own hands, and to treat his ministers as executive officers. Talleyrand, often to his disgust, was obliged to follow the emperor wherever he went, often amid the hardships of camp life in the winter season.

Talleyrand's foreign policy is naturally not marked by any great originality. His business was usually to do as he was told, but at the same time his master was willing to listen to him, and was often prepared to follow his view of the situation. Moreover, the two men thought so entirely alike upon many subjects that a conflict of opinions was improbable. He readily fell in with Napoleon's views upon the position of the clergy and the arrangement of the Concordat. The result, so far as concerned Talleyrand personally, was his reconciliation with the Pope, which was followed by his marriage, and in 1802 he enjoyed the only period of rest and repose which came to him under Napoleon's government. Talleyrand was now some fifty years of age; he retained both the manners and the dress of the old *régime*, and maintained a huge establishment upon a princely scale, the expenses of which might to some extent account for his readiness to sell his diplomatic offices to anyone who could pay for them. Those who came to see him found a calm and almost apathetic diplomatist, whose manner really concealed great abilities, and who would cling obstinately to his own views in the face of argument and persuasion. Upon very few occasions in his life did he trouble himself to answer either calumny or abuse, either from an imperturbable sense of the futility of such a proceeding or, as his enemies asserted, because he had not the delicacy of mind to resent an insult. Calm and deliberation were at any rate outward characteristics. "Don't be in such a hurry," he said to one of the Swiss envoys in 1802; "time is a great cure-all; give time a chance." And to another: "Most things are done by not doing them". Or again: "The only sound principle in life is to have no principles". Whether these aphorisms are authentic or not, they fully represent his diplomatic attitude. He concluded treaties with almost every European state, drew up four constitutions for various Italian Governments, and founded the republics of Holland, Switzerland, and the Valais, which were dependent upon France. This was the work of 1801 and 1802, and was summarized by the Austrian minister for foreign affairs in the statement, "that its results were more formidable than war itself". This was a far-sighted observation; before very long, Talleyrand was obliged to draw up a document incorporating the ideas of the Continental blockade and the dream of universal empire which became Napoleon's ruin.

Talleyrand did his utmost to prevent the execution of the Duc d'Enghien, probably rather from loyalty to his master than because he believed in his policy. The empire found him acting as grand

chamberlain, a post which he accepted reluctantly, knowing, as he did, the difficulty of organizing the emperor's private life. He was present when Napoleon placed the iron crown upon his own head at Milan, in May, 1805. It fell to his lot to break the news of Trafalgar to the emperor, who was able to answer it with news of the victorious progress of the Grand Army. Talleyrand was present at the battle of Austerlitz, and afterwards exerted his influence to make Napoleon conclude a peace, which, however, was not to be. He realized that Napoleon's boundless ambition would overthrow him, and did his utmost to restrain his progress by the conclusion of special treaties. He was obliged to follow the army to the battle of Eylau, and to take charge of the commissariat in addition to his ordinary work. He was now beginning to realize that Napoleon was slipping from his grasp, and that he was becoming rather a tool than a minister. He began to wonder what would happen if the emperor were killed or overthrown, and he and his friends considered that a Bourbon restoration was the only way out of the difficulty. In 1807 he resigned his office, and introduced his successor to his staff with the characteristic words: "Here, sir, you have a number of men whom I can highly recommend and who will give you every satisfaction. You will find them clever and punctual, and, thanks to my care, entirely devoid of zeal." When this announcement was received with an expression of surprise, he continued: "Yes, sir, with the exception of a few clerks, who are inclined to address envelopes in an excessive hurry, all officials in this department are inspired by the profoundest calm. When you have to settle the interests of Europe with the emperor, you will learn the importance of avoiding any excessive haste to seal and dispatch the announcement of his wishes." In this scene with which Talleyrand entertained the emperor originated the aphorism attributed to him: *Point de zèle.*

Talleyrand's perspicacity had foreseen that Napoleon's interference in Spain marked the decline of his fortunes. The emperor himself felt that a Bourbon on the throne of Spain was a fatal danger to himself and his dynasty, but his assertion that Talleyrand was the moving spirit in his Spanish policy is contradicted by the diplomatist's *Mémoirs*. It was shortly after this time that he advised the Tsar to make a stand against Napoleon, and Alexander himself was afterwards forced to admit that Talleyrand's advice had been excellent. Both Vienna and St. Petersburg began to realize that the diplomatist was no longer an unconditional supporter of the emperor. This may have been a disloyal action, but it was successfully concealed from the emperor at the time. Talleyrand was still retained by the emperor, who used him in the negotiations for the divorce with Josephine and for discussion of the proposed marriage alliance with Austria. After he had definitely embarked upon his Spanish expedition the breach between Talleyrand and Napoleon became complete. Napoleon had heard that Talleyrand was decrying his policy in Paris, and poured abuse upon him when he



THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA, 1815

The painting was commissioned by Talleyrand, who is standing on the extreme right hand of the picture (third from the end)

From the miniature by Isabey in Windsor Castle

Talleyrand

returned. The statesman was not again consulted upon Napoleon's affairs for a long time to come. After the catastrophe of Leipzig he offered Talleyrand the ministry of foreign affairs, but he declined, with the remark that "not everyone would care to bury himself in ruins". When the end came, and the royalists in Bordeaux proclaimed Louis XVIII as king after the British had crossed the Pyrenees, the Government in Paris was in a state of panic. Talleyrand pursued a waiting policy, and warned the empress regent that she must not leave Paris if she wished to save France from the Bourbons. This attitude he maintained until the end; he repeated it when the allies were marching upon the capital, and he knew that his words would be followed by the reading of letters from Napoleon commanding the departure of the empress and his son. It then became plain that France could only recover her position as a nation if she could conclude new treaties with Europe, retaining her boundaries and avoiding national humiliation. A monarchy of some kind was indispensable, nor could it be recalled by a regicide Government; therefore a negotiator was required who could express the wishes of France. Talleyrand stepped into this position.

After the entry of the allies Alexander conferred with a number of diplomatists, among whom Talleyrand was the only Frenchman. Talleyrand demanded the restoration of the legitimate monarchy, and to justify his demand he asserted "that the Bourbons are a principle, everything else is an intrigue". He induced the Senate to pronounce a condemnation of the empire, and won over the old Jacobins to the restoration policy. He became head of the provisional Government which was appointed on 1 April, 1814, and he warned the allies that Elba was not the right place for Napoleon's retirement. Then came the re-entry of Louis XVIII, and of the royalist party, who had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing during the years of exile. Louis was received in Paris with wild rejoicings, but he made no favourable impression upon those who could think, while the sight of the Old Guard and their depression threw a gloom over the proceedings. Talleyrand obliged the king to accept the new constitution, to confirm the alienation of the national property, and to promise that no one should be persecuted for his political opinions. Talleyrand then plunged into the work of settling preliminaries of peace and preparing for the Congress of Vienna. There his diplomacy reached its most brilliant heights. The Congress soon appeared more anxious to quarrel for the spoils than to secure the peace of Europe, and no one could have been more skilful in turning the opposition of the various sections to the advantage of his own country than Talleyrand. Though there was considerable discontent in Paris, he left the impression that the military force of France was still formidable. The return from Elba opened the Hundred Days, and the Bourbons once more left the country. Talleyrand remained upon the side of the new government, and supported the king's authority in Vienna to the last. Waterloo had been fought three days before his arrival,

and the king had left Ghent to enter France under the protection of the British. Talleyrand strongly objected to this policy; he felt that the monarchy should never return to France under the protection of foreign powers, but should transfer the seat of government to some other town, form a responsible ministry, and prepare to act against the allies if action became necessary. His attempts to explain to the king that the belief in monarchical rule by divine right had disappeared and that kings were now supposed to exist by the will and for the benefit of their subjects made no impression. He threatened to resign, but at another meeting the king persuaded him to complete the charter by publishing a number of liberal ordinances and by issuing a general amnesty. On the second occupation of Paris by the allies he was unable to secure any modification in the contribution required for the support of the army of occupation. Nor could he retain those works of art of which France had robbed foreign capitals. But he succeeded in winning the Emperor Alexander to his policy. The emperor was then absorbed by the idea of the Holy Alliance, and was ready to support Britain in maintaining the integrity of France as against Prussia. The condition of this success was Talleyrand's own disappearance from the scene. He resigned and was succeeded in office by the Duc de Richelieu. He expected to be recalled, but he underrated the ingratitude of the Bourbons.

Talleyrand spent the year 1816 in residence at his country seat at Valençay, when he was not in Paris writing his *Memoirs*. This work was undertaken to show that he could claim credit for the restoration of peace to Europe and the French dynasty to France. In 1820 a crisis seemed to have arrived which Talleyrand thought might bring about his recall. The assassination of the Duc de Berry was followed by the formation of the Richelieu ministry, which developed a strict censorship of the press. The Revolution in Spain also roused a cry of indignation throughout Europe for French intervention. Talleyrand supported the policy of peace abroad and conciliation at home, and gathered a party round him influential in society and in the press, of whom the most prominent member was Guizot. Guided by him this party overthrew ministry after ministry, until the Polignac ministry brought about the final downfall of the Bourbons and the Revolution of 1830. Talleyrand was then in Paris, and urged that the Duc d'Orléans should enter the capital and assume the title of lieutenant-general of the kingdom. The choice seemed to lie between him and a republic. Louis Philippe became king of the French on 9 August, 1830, and in the following month he appointed Talleyrand ambassador in London. "England", wrote Talleyrand in that year, "is the country with which France should cultivate the most friendly relations. Her colonial losses have removed the source of rivalry between them. Though some powers still believe in the divine right of kings, England and France no longer subscribe to that doctrine. Both Governments have adopted the principle of non-intervention. Let both declare loudly that they are resolved to maintain peace and their voices will not be

raised in vain." These words were written in reference to the outbreak in the Netherlands in 1830. The Belgians had declared themselves independent of Holland, had adopted a liberal constitution, and elected Leopold of Saxe-Coburg as their king. At one time it seemed that a European war might again break out over the question. Then the son of Louis Philippe was proposed for the throne of the new kingdom. These questions were handled by Talleyrand with masterly insight; while considering the interests of France he never lost sight of those of Europe. His real difficulties were rather in Paris than in London, and to his influence was due the fact that Prince Leopold was eventually adopted as the candidate for the crown of Belgium.

Talleyrand resigned his ambassadorship in London, in November, 1834. The passing of the Reform Bill inspired him with some distrust of British policy. He expected that an aristocratic Government would be democratized, and that he could not therefore continue the policy which he had hitherto successfully supported. He was also growing old, and he felt himself no longer equal to the work. His last public appearance was in March, 1838, when he pronounced a eulogy at the Institute upon an old colleague, Count Reinhardt. He had been reconciled to the Church, and on his deathbed he signed a document addressed to the Papacy, expressing his regret for the scandal which he had caused the Church, and excusing his conduct upon the plea that he had been forced into a clerical career, for which he was not fitted by nature. He died on 17 May, 1838.

Upon his character the most contrary opinions have been passed. "A man living in falsehood and on falsehood, yet not what you call a false man", was the judgment of Carlyle. He certainly reached the summit of his ambition, but, though he was feared and admired, he was rarely respected. But if his policy was at times tortuous or marked by duplicity the general results of it are clear. The stormy scenes through which he lived had led him to the conclusion that France required a monarchy founded upon free institutions, and his belief that the true foundation of the state was based upon the economic welfare of the masses, and was not to be built up by cabinet intrigues, placed him far in advance of the statesmen of his age.

CHAPTER VI

Napoleon (A.D. 1769-1821)

Napoleon Bonaparte, which form of the name has replaced the more correct Buonaparte, was born on 15 August, 1769, at Ajaccio, in Corsica. The family were originally Florentine nobles, who had been driven into exile by civic strife in the sixteenth century. The fortunes of the family declined, and Napoleon's father was nothing more than a needy local lawyer. His mother was a woman of strong character, but neither of his parents seems to have possessed any such extraordinary abilities as would explain their son's greatness upon grounds of heredity. Seven other children of the family survived, and were afterwards raised by Napoleon to the rank of princes, and in three cases to the thrones of kings. Napoleon's childhood saw the struggle of Corsica with Genoa, under the great Corsican leader Paoli, who secured her independence until France conquered the island. From 1779 until 1784 Napoleon was sent to the military school at Brienne, an unhappy period of his life; his foreign appearance and his uncouth French accent naturally made him the mockery of his schoolfellows. He showed great mathematical ability and considerable interest in history, but in other respects he was not distinguished. From Brienne he went to the military school at Paris, and in 1785 he received a sub-lieutenancy, spending the next five years at various military stations in France. During this time he studied military history, tactics, and strategy with the utmost earnestness, while law and constitutional science also claimed his attention. The industry which he displayed and his close attention to detail are shown by the numerous extracts and notes which he then made, and which, for the most part, remain unpublished. In 1791 he declared for the Revolution, and took some part in its progress in Corsica. He attempted to secure command of the National Guard, which was then being formed in the island, but as he thus exceeded his leave of absence he was struck off the army list. By the spring of 1792 he was back again in Paris in poverty, and with no career before him. He saw the tragedy of 10 August, when the palace of the Tuilleries was sacked after the slaughter of the Swiss Guards. This event was followed by the September massacres and the advance of the army of the allies upon Paris to the rescue of the king. In the general demand for military forces to resist the invaders, Napoleon recovered his place in the army. He took no part in the campaign of Dumouriez or the battle of Valmy, though in 1793

he served on board the French force sent to capture Sardinia. The expedition was a failure, owing to the hopeless lack of discipline which prevailed on board. The trial and execution of the king, the fall of the Girondins, and the Reign of Terror had roused a spirit that spread through the provinces in France. Corsica, led by Paoli, desired to be left alone; the Corsicans had little objection either to priests or nobles, and Paoli was summoned to Paris to answer for his conduct. At this crisis Napoleon declared for the French so-called Government; his people condemned him as a traitor, and banished him with his family from the island. He bestowed his family in safety at Marseilles, and then joined the republican levies which were engaged in crushing the great royalist rising in the south, and is said to have taken part in the siege of Lyons. But in this campaign he first made his name at Toulon, when his genius as an artillery officer delivered the town to the French and drove away the allied fleets. He then served with the army of Italy in the Alps, nominally under command of Masséna, but Napoleon was now well known in military circles, and probably planned most of the operations. The Sardinian force which guarded the paths to the plain of Piedmont was cleverly turned, and the French were left in possession of the seaboard to the east of Genoa. In this campaign Napoleon at any rate gained an acquaintance of the ground which was afterwards to become the scene of some of his most famous exploits.

There seems to be little doubt that he hated the Reign of Terror, but that as a soldier he was obliged to obey orders. He was, however, intimate with the brother of Robespierre, and after his fall the ensuing reaction placed him in a position of some unpopularity, if not of danger. His past services were forgotten or disregarded, and he was given the humble rank of infantry general in the army of the west. This post he refused to accept, and his name was soon struck off the rolls. But in 1795 work was found for him in Paris. The Convention had now a new constitution, vesting the executive power in the Directory, a body of five persons, and providing for two legislative bodies known as the Council of Five Hundred and the Council of Ancients, the latter being 250 in number, while all the members were to be over forty-five years of age. The Convention was afraid of surrendering its authority to an entirely new assembly, and therefore provided that two-thirds of the representatives in the new bodies should be chosen from the old deputies. This restriction roused a great tumult in Paris. The city armed for a rising, and it seemed as if another revolution was about to begin. At this moment the panic-stricken Directors heard of Napoleon as a man capable of dealing with a crisis, and gave him command of the troops. His arrangements were made with characteristic completeness; he secured the only artillery in the city and posted his little army round the Louvre, being careful to secure his retreat. When a mob of 40,000 men emerged from the slums of old Paris, the result of the conflict was never doubtful. They were met, in Carlyle's words, "by a whiff of grape shot", and were scattered in every direction. Napoleon was

thanked by the Convention and appointed general of the interior, and for some months he was busy strengthening the National Guards and crushing the smouldering embers of the revolt. The following year he was married to Josephine Beauharnais, the widow of a noble who had fallen during the Reign of Terror. Shortly afterwards he was appointed to command the army of Italy. He had previously drawn up a plan for the conquest of this country which had been commended by military experts, and some members of the Directory may have been glad to get rid of a man whose tremendous genius was already beginning to assert itself. Moreover, the French army had done practically nothing for some time, and was in want of a chief.

Republican generals had repelled invasion from the frontiers of France; Belgium and Holland had been overrun, and the latter country organized into a republic, while the Austrians and Prussians had been driven back upon the east. The Convention had called upon all nations, in 1792, to rise against that which they termed despotism, and had promised to help any peoples who wished to gain their liberty. This declaration, and the intention to overturn all existing Governments, had been the chief cause of the coalition against France, and when the Convention abandoned this impossible idea, Prussia, Spain, and other countries were willing to come to terms; in the treaties of Bâle they recognized the French Republican Government in 1795. After this date Austria and England alone remained hostile to the Directory, which resolved to attack Austria first, and formed two large armies upon the middle Rhine, under Moreau and Jourdan, for the invasion of Austria. The third army, concentrated near Nice, was to drive the Austrians out of Italy, and here Napoleon had been placed in command. When he reached Nice, early in 1796, he found some 35,000 to 40,000 men in a state of destitution and discontent. They were, however, veterans and capable soldiers, inspired with revolutionary ideas, and ready to respond to the vigorous address which their new commander delivered. "Soldiers," he said, "you are badly fed and almost naked. I have come to lead you to the most fertile fields of the world. There you will find large cities, rich provinces, glory, and wealth. Soldiers of Italy, will you fail in courage?" This was not the spirit of that declaration in which the Convention had offered freedom to struggling nations; it was rather an address of a marauding chief to a band of robbers, and it marks the beginning of the change of spirit which soon made the liberating armies of France the scourge of Europe. Napoleon started before the roads were even free from snow, and forced the passage of the mountains between the Apennines and the maritime Alps. His clever strategy obliged the enemy to retreat between Milan and Turin. He attacked them in detail, and in ten days routed two armies far superior to his own. The Bridge of Lodi was a hard-fought engagement, which assured his success, while another series of battles defeated Austria upon the line of the Adige, and ended in the capture of Mantua. The astonishing results of the campaign are not exaggerated in Napoleon's address to his army:



The earliest known portrait: age 22

Detail from painting by Greuze



As officer of the Corsican Volunteers

From painting by Philippoteaux



In Coronation Robes (1805)

From miniature by C. Chatillon



As Emperor

From painting by Horace Vernet

NAPOLEON AT VARIOUS PERIODS OF HIS CAREER

Soldiers, the capture of Mantua has ended the war of Italy. You have been victorious in fourteen pitched battles and seventy actions; you have taken 100,000 prisoners, 500 field pieces, 2000 heavy cannon, and four pontoon trains. The contributions you have imposed upon the conquered countries have maintained and paid the army, and you have sent thirty million francs to the minister of finance for the public treasury. You have enriched the museum of Paris with three hundred masterpieces of ancient and modern Italy, for the production of which thirty centuries were required; you have conquered for the republic the finest countries in Europe. The kings of Sardinia and Naples, the Pope and the Duke of Parma are separated from the coalition. You have expelled the English from Leghorn, Genoa, and Corsica. Destinies yet higher await you, and of these you will prove yourselves worthy. Of the many foes who combined to stifle our republic at birth the emperor alone is left.

Attempts have been made to excuse Napoleon's action in levying contributions from conquered states, and if he came as a conqueror no excuse is needed. But it is impossible to combine conquest and liberation as an apology for his action. Money he may indeed have taken from the class technically known as aristocrats, but the seizure of the artistic monuments which he sent to Paris was worthy only of a Verres. While he had been gaining this remarkable series of successes, the other armies had met with severe defeats in Germany at the hands of the Archduke Charles, who showed himself a very capable commander. Bonaparte therefore crossed the Alps and marched upon Vienna. The emperor, Francis II, was prepared to make peace, and negotiations ended in the treaty of Campo Formio in 1797, by which Austria abandoned her Belgian provinces and Francis recognized the Rhine as the French eastern frontier. Northern Italy had been formed into the Cis-Alpine republic, which Austria agreed to recognize. She was allowed to retain possession of Venice. Napoleon reached Paris in the first days of December, and was greeted with extraordinary enthusiasm and with a magnificence which resembled the triumph of a consul at Rome. He had accomplished almost literally the plans which he had drawn up two years before. His action heralded a revolution in war, and the rapidity of his movements terrified, as the depths of his combinations baffled, generals who were bound to the old traditional paths. He had also given a new direction to the policy of the Revolution. His alliances and treaties had been based upon self-interest and not upon sentimental sympathy with the rights of man. He had stopped democratic risings in the Italian states, and had shown his belief that liberty and licence are not convertible terms.

Soon after Napoleon's return to Paris the Directory gave him command of an army intended for an attack upon Britain. Napoleon visited Boulogne, Calais, and Dunkirk, and, after examining the details of the proposed plan, pronounced the attempt as hopeless. He considered, however, that Britain might be successfully attacked in her possessions, and proposed that Malta should be seized and Egypt conquered and colonized. France would then be able to control the

eastern trade, and would have formed a base of operations for an attack upon India. The Directory were the more ready to accept this proposal as they were somewhat afraid of Napoleon himself. Rumours were in circulation that he proposed to seize the governmental power and so to anticipate the designs of the royalists, who were then showing great activity. And when, foreseeing the approach of this danger, he desired to delay the start of the expedition, the Directory insisted upon his immediate departure. Napoleon therefore left Toulon in May, 1798, with the fleet which Nelson afterwards shattered at the battle of the Nile, with an army of some 30,000 men and many illustrious scholars and scientists. Malta was captured; Nelson missed the French fleet on its way, and on 2 July Napoleon captured Alexandria and advanced to Cairo. The battle of the Pyramids followed the famous appeal to the forty generations looking down from their heights; the Mameluke force was scattered; Cairo and lower Egypt fell into the hands of the French. Then came the battle of the Nile, which severed the French communication with Europe, and practically imprisoned Napoleon in Egypt. He proceeded to organize the government of the country, while the scientific men explored its antiquities. He established factories, built mills, set up a mint, projected improvements in irrigation and agriculture, and viewed with approval the idea of a canal through the isthmus of Suez.

While he was thus displaying his genius for administration, France had been overwhelmed by difficulties. She had set up a number of republics in Italy, and had intervened in a revolution in Switzerland; but the capture of Malta and the invasion of Egypt had united Russia and the Turks. Austria seized the opportunity of Napoleon's absence to support them, while Britain gave the coalition what help she could. A combined Russian and Austrian army overran Italy, the new-founded republics collapsed, the Archduke Charles defeated the French in Swabia, and two powerful forces were approaching Provence and Alsace. Masséna alone held out with his little army amid the Alps. The natural result was confusion in Paris. The Directory was accused of exiling Napoleon, whose genius alone could save the republic. The royalists took advantage of the confusion to become aggressive, while the threats of the mob actually caused apprehensions of another reign of terror. Meanwhile Napoleon, on hearing that the Turks had joined the Russians and were proposing to recapture Egypt, led his army into Syria. He seems to have entertained vast ideas of reaching Constantinople through Asia Minor and attacking Europe in reverse, as he phrased it. But he was brought to a stand before Acre, where Sir Sidney Smith, assisted by the Turks, repulsed every assault, and obliged him to retire to Egypt. A second Turkish army was defeated near Aboukir, and he then, for the first time, received definite news of France's desperate condition. He at once resolved to return home, and left Kléber in command in Egypt. After a dangerous voyage he contrived to elude the British fleet, and reached France in October, 1799.


He was welcomed with the greatest enthusiasm, and found that the crisis of danger had passed as far as a foreign invasion was concerned. The coalition, instead of invading the country, had sent the Archduke Charles to the lower Rhine, to co-operate with the Duke of York in his mismanaged attempt upon the Netherlands. Masséna had defeated the Russians, and France for the moment was saved. But the country was in a state of anarchy and the Directory was most unpopular. Public opinion in France, especially that of the moderate party, who feared a recrudescence of Jacobinism, was inclined to welcome the appointment of a dictator. Sieyès, the most competent of the five Directors, was convinced that the existing government was impossible. The influence of Talleyrand secured an agreement between himself and Napoleon, and a *coup d'état* was arranged. The councils were removed to St. Cloud, 5 miles from Paris, on the ground that the Paris mob intended to attack them, but with the real object of dissolving them at a distance from the capital, that no immediate excitement might be caused. Meanwhile, Paris was garrisoned with Napoleon's devoted adherents. The Directors privy to the conspiracy resigned, and the others were placed under arrest. Paris declared for Napoleon, and he thought he need only appear at St. Cloud to obtain the support, or at least the consent, of the councils. The Council of the Ancients was won over with some difficulty; but, the Council of the Five Hundred had realized the nature of the trick played upon them, was in a state of fierce excitement, and greeted Napoleon with shouts of "Down with the tyrant!" Like Cromwell, he ordered a body of grenadiers to clear the chamber; the deputies fled in all directions, and the first French republic was at an end. It was plain to every thinking man that the revolutionary constitution had failed, that France at home and abroad was in a state of collapse, and that an all-powerful genius was required to save the nation from disaster. Criticism of the manner in which Napoleon obtained his power is beside the mark; at any rate he succeeded in avoiding bloodshed, and the people of France welcomed his success.

After the Government of the Directory had been thus overthrown, Napoleon entrusted the task of preparing a new constitution to Sieyès. The executive power was vested in three consuls nominated for a term of ten years. The first of these held the real authority; the other two were merely his advisers. Napoleon naturally became First Consul. A council of state, a tribunate, a legislature, and a senate were also set on foot to conduct the other governmental functions. They were appointed by an extraordinarily complex decimal system devised by Sieyès and easily controlled by the consuls, so that these latter were henceforward supreme. There is no doubt that Napoleon was extremely well qualified for the high position which he had assumed. His faculty for organization was as great as his genius for generalship. He had worked hard at the study of political science, and in Italy and Egypt he had gained great experience in the management of civil affairs. Politically he was known as a moderate man, as a Corsican

his share in the Revolution had been insignificant, and his objection to the worst excesses of that movement was notorious. France believed that he could consolidate her power and heal her wounds, and Napoleon himself described in his Memoirs the outburst of national feeling which called him to the First Consulship as one of the greatest incidents in his career.

Napoleon's first task was to bring some order into the domestic administration of the country. The financial condition seemed almost desperate; the country was in a state of practical bankruptcy, the treasury had no funds and the Government no credit. Napoleon's appointment restored confidence; bankers and capitalists advanced sufficient money for immediate needs, and with the help of Gaudin, an official of the old *régime*, Napoleon was able to bring financial matters into order. The unjust exactions extorted from wealthy men, the bad administration of the funds, the discredit of the Government paper, and the reckless legislation of the revolutionary Government had been chiefly responsible for the decline. The First Consul created a Bank of France and a sinking fund, and by a strong centralized system of financial administration he secured to the state the full benefit of the taxes collected. A revolt in La Vendée was put down, numbers of exiles were allowed to return to France, and were assured that the past was forgotten if they would be loyal for the future; churches were reopened, and the species of insanity known as the worship of the Goddess of Reason disappeared. In fact, so many institutions of the old *régime* were restored by Napoleon that some leaders of the royalist party actually thought that he meant to replace the Bourbons on the throne. Those who entertained this idea knew little of Napoleon, and the Comte de Provence was informed that an attempt at invasion would be repelled with the utmost vigour.

Throughout this work of reorganization Napoleon had also been making preparations for war. His offers of peace to Austria and Britain were rejected; but Britain was impotent upon the Continent after the failure in Holland, and Austria had been isolated by the withdrawal of the Russians from the coalition. At the same time a great Austrian army was threatening Provence, and another was approaching the Rhine. Napoleon gathered forces by conscription, and placed an army on the Rhine under Moreau for the invasion of Germany. He himself took command of another which was quietly gathered at the foot of the Alps, for the purpose of attacking the Austrians in Italy. Then followed the memorable passage of the Alps by the Great St. Bernard in the spring of 1800, and the utter defeat of the Austrians at Marengo. On the very day of that battle the Egyptian conquest was lost. Kléber, who had been left in command, was assassinated, and the whole French force surrendered to the British. This, however, did not alter the position of affairs in Europe. Moreau defeated the Austrians at Hohenlinden, and the way was open for a march on Vienna. The emperor, Francis II, was obliged to sign a treaty of peace at Lunéville early in 1801, which practically ratified



the peace of Campo Formio, though Austria's power in Italy was destroyed. The treaty also provided for the reorganization of the German empire, which brought the system known as the Holy Roman Empire to an end. The advance of the French frontier to the Rhine had deprived a number of German princes of their dominions. They were now indemnified by grants of territory from the great German bishoprics, and a committee was formed to settle the adjustment of these matters. Most of the ecclesiastical and free states were eventually suppressed, and a number of limited monarchies were created or enlarged, though the system of reorganization was not completed until some years later.

Britain thus found herself isolated, and, weary of strife, agreed to sign the Peace of Amiens in 1802. It was rather an armistice than a peace: Britain restored the French colonies except Trinidad and Ceylon, and agreed, upon conditions, to give back Malta; but she refused to recognize the new republic set up by France, though France was willing to withdraw from Naples and the Papal states. Seeing that commercial and colonial interests were the main point of dispute between France and Britain, the adjustment of these matters was not likely to be settled by a treaty so hastily concluded. As France was now free to move across the sea, Napoleon made some attempt to secure a French colonial empire in the west. He had given the grand duchy of Tuscany to a Spanish prince in return for the cession of Louisiana, and by the Treaty of Amiens France had regained her West Indian colonies. The island of Haiti had, however, revolted during the Revolution, and a republic had been set up by the negroes and mulattoes. Napoleon's attempt to reconquer the island for France was defeated by the climate and the courage of the inhabitants.

Napoleon was now obliged to turn his attention to the domestic administration of France. Under the old *régime* a policy of centralization had been pursued from the days of Louis XIV. Against this the Revolution had reacted, and when Burke said that France was split into forty thousand republics he was using language not altogether hyperbolical. Local self-government had become a fetish, and every commune, at one time, was supposed to be independent. Then the local bodies who governed the communes were themselves unchecked by any central authority, and were completely inexperienced and incapable. Had it not been for the general supremacy exerted by Paris, disintegration must have followed. Napoleon retained the revolutionary divisions of the country known as departments, and placed an official at the head of each of these; he was represented by subordinates who supervised every sub-division down to the commune. The prefects, sub-prefects, and mayors thus appointed to direct local affairs were dependent upon the chief power in the state, and though this outwardly was a return to the institutions of the old *régime*, it has none the less survived almost unchanged ever since its institution by Napoleon. It has proved economical and efficient, and if it was not

calculated to foster local energy and self-reliance, it none the less seems to have been in complete consonance with the temperament of the French nation. The administration of justice, again, had fallen into great confusion under the revolutionary Government. In accordance with the absurd principle of government by the people, and for the people, judges had been elected, with the result that the laws had become uncertain, and the courts had lost all public confidence. Napoleon restricted the appointment of judges to the state, and formed a number of Courts of Appeal. He also undertook the greatest of his works, the compilation of what is known as the Civil Code or the Code Napoleon. Had he done nothing else throughout his life, this achievement would have given him a place among the great lawgivers of history. The law of France, before he took the matter in hand, consisted of a number of customs and edicts derived from ancient usages north of the Loire and from Roman law in the southern provinces, in many cases obsolete and unintelligible. The National Assembly had begun the work of codification, but in the confusion of the Revolution period its labours had come to an end. Napoleon began the task afresh, and called in the most learned jurists of France to his aid. He often presided at their sittings, and the touch of his hand is visible in the whole of the result. Any examination of its provisions would demand a separate volume. Generally speaking, it secured the results of the Revolution, and swept away the old oppressions and abuses that were inheritances from the feudal age. Many countries borrowed from it, and it profoundly influenced the legal systems of Italy, Spain, Prussia, West Germany, Switzerland, and Holland.

The First Consul also paid much attention to education. He was unable to secure a universal system of elementary education, but for higher education he did much and established military schools. He also understood the influence which can be usefully exerted in a state by outward rewards and distinctions, even when these were purely honorary. Hence the establishment of the Legion of Honour. An even more successful achievement was his settlement of ecclesiastical affairs. The civil constitution of the clergy had caused a bitter schism within the nation. By this system Church property was nationalized and the Church was to be supported by salaries paid by the nation. All clergy were to be chosen by election, and were required to take an oath to support the new constitution. A large number declined to take the oath, and the majority of the French clergy became the bitter enemies of the Revolution. Since 1794 the Government had been unable or unwilling to pay their salaries, with the result that many parts of the country were entirely deprived of the consolations of religion, and the position of the Church was both a national danger and a public scandal. Napoleon realized that a hostile clergy living abroad was a menace to the safety of the state. He also realized the value of religious life to a nation. He was himself a man of religious feeling, and in 1802 he secured an agreement with the Pope, known

Napoleon

as the Concordat. The Catholic faith was declared to be that of the mass of the nation, but the supremacy of the state was carefully secured. The bishops, jurors and non-jurors, were to resign their offices, and Napoleon would then reappoint them as he pleased, it being understood that appointments would be made impartially from both parties. Thus the long quarrel between the priestly ranks ended, while the state reassumed the charge of the salaries of the clergy. The restoration of the Church was celebrated with great pomp at Notre Dame, but at the same time the Concordat and the restoration of religion roused a large body of opposition. It could not escape the observation of even a casual observer that France was reverting from a republic to a despotism. The Legion of Honour, for instance, offended the old republican spirit, which still clung to the fetish of equality. But the fact remained that Napoleon's domestic policy was the most beneficent that France could ever have received. A statesman Napoleon never was, but he was a soldier and administrator of extraordinary genius. His insight was able to penetrate the immediate needs of France, and his management successfully introduced reforms with the smallest possible amount of friction. By the end of 1803 France was in an unusually strong position. Napoleon had intervened in the disputes between the German powers, arising out of the indemnification, with such dexterity as to create a new balance of power in Germany which increased Prussia and Bavaria at the expense of Austria. France's credit at home had increased, her public debt was paid, trade and manufactures revived, agriculture was flourishing. The reconstruction of roads, the opening of canals, the improved local administration had given the people confidence; they had ceased haranguing about the rights of man and had settled down to work. Napoleon was thus regarded as a beneficent saviour, and there was a confused idea that the head of a Government which had done so much for France should not owe its stability merely to a ten years' appointment. The proposal that Napoleon should be made Consul for life, to prevent any interruption of the work of restoration and reform, was almost unanimously approved, and thus the First Consul rose one step higher towards the imperial throne.

In 1803 war broke out again between Britain and France. The occasion of the dispute was the possession of Malta. The island was to be returned to the knights under the protection of some European power, but no one could be found willing to take the responsibility, and in view of the increasing power of France a strong party in Britain were anxious to retain possession of the island. Diplomatic friction, for which France was largely to blame, ended in a declaration of war. A plot against Napoleon's life was formed at this time, hatched by the royalists, headed by a Breton named Georges Cadoudal, and supported by certain British officials. As it was necessary to gain the support of the army if a Bourbon restoration was to be attempted, overtures were made to some of Napoleon's generals, and Pichegru was implicated. The plot was discovered and the chief

European History

conspirators arrested. Pichegru committed suicide in prison, and Cadoudal was executed. Up to this point Napoleon's method of dealing with conspiracies had been unexceptional; he now embarked upon an action which seriously damaged his reputation and contributed to his downfall. During the investigations it had been stated that a Bourbon prince would join the conspirators in Paris. This was supposed to be the Comte d'Artois, and a watch was kept on the Normandy shore, where he was expected to land from England. As he did not appear, Napoleon looked elsewhere to find some prince who would satisfy the conditions stated, and fixed his attention upon the Duke d'Enghien, who was then living quietly at Ettenheim in Baden, near the Rhine. The mistake of a spy misled Napoleon, and he seized the prince, in defiance of all international law, carried him to Vincennes, secured his condemnation before a mock tribunal, and had him shot the same night before an open grave which had been dug even before the sentence was passed. Apart from the fact that the young prince was entirely innocent of any direct complicity with this plot, or was generally so regarded, the act was impolitic, because it ultimately led to the formation of another league against France. There was no reason to suppose that Napoleon was terrified by the thought of assassination, but he intended to give the Bourbons a lesson and put a stop, once and for all, to plots of this kind. The measures for this purpose were effectual, and no further conspiracies were heard of. But the nation felt that the Government and position of France depended upon Napoleon's life, and that if he were assassinated before he could nominate a successor, anarchy would be the result. A strong feeling began that Napoleon should be raised to an hereditary throne in order to secure the safety and stability of his government. A decree of the senate conferring upon him the title of emperor was submitted to the people for approval and was almost unanimously ratified. Napoleon was crowned by Pope Pius VII in Notre Dame on 2 December, 1804. He wished to regard himself, not as the successor of the Bourbons, but as continuing the empire of Charlemagne. The successor of the Holy Roman Empire was consecrated by the Roman Pontiff, and thus the revolution became a military monarchy and reverted to the old form of a feudal state. After the Reformation, after the English and American revolutions, after the French declaration of the rights of man, a universal dictatorship was an obvious anachronism; but as Napoleon took up his residence in the palace of the Tuilleries, and proceeded to revive the splendour and formality of the Bourbon court, so the surrounding republics which France had created were transformed into monarchies. Napoleon crowned himself at Milan with the iron crown of the Lombards and assumed the title of king of Italy in 1805. In the same year the Ligurian republic, which included Genoa and part of Piedmont, was added to the French empire. The Batavian republic became the kingdom of Holland, with Napoleon's brother Louis upon the throne. Thus the Revolution came to an end. Its proclaimed

Napoleon

objects were reversed, and past and future conquests became dependent upon Napoleon's empire.


During these transactions Napoleon was preparing to invade Britain, a project which came to nothing, as he was never able to command the sea. His aspirations in this direction were ended by the battle of Trafalgar. For the same reason he sold to the United States the territory of Louisiana, which he had acquired from Spain: only a maritime power could defend such great and distant possessions. Meanwhile the younger Pitt in England was the life and soul of the coalition against France. Early in 1805 Britain and Russia formed an alliance and strove to initiate a general European league. This was soon joined by Austria and other states, and Napoleon's abandonment of the invasion of Britain was decided by the news that an Austrian army was in movement against him. Ulm and Austerlitz saw the end of Austria's hopes. She was forced to give up Venice, and cede Tyrol and other districts to Bavaria, which completed the reorganization of Germany begun by Napoleon after the campaign of Marengo. It may be said that after Austerlitz the Holy Roman Empire came to an end. It had existed for nearly one thousand years, since its revival under Charlemagne. The emperor, Francis II, resigned the imperial crown in 1806, and was known henceforth as Francis I, emperor of Austria. This reconstruction of the German system was a preparation for the German empire of the present day, and of all Napoleon's acts few had more far-reaching results. And the introduction of those reforms which had proved so beneficial to France, the abolition of the remnants of the feudal system, enabled German states to become strong and prosperous. Thus Napoleon shattered another great coalition and increased the military grandeur of his empire, which was rapidly becoming a military despotism. But it was a despotism not founded upon any national sentiment, nor were the territories conquered by France and the kingdoms dependent upon her power likely to become any permanent means of support. Italy, for instance, with a foreign ruler, was outwardly in the same position as she had been under Austria, while the dissolution of the old Holy Roman Empire and the creation of new kingdoms, ruled though they were in Napoleon's interests, broke up the old barriers, obliterated old jealousies, and encouraged a general movement for liberation and freedom.

Austerlitz had been the death of Pitt, and Fox, who succeeded him in power, had begun to make overtures to Napoleon. But it was impossible to remove outstanding differences, and the death of Fox soon left the war party in England predominant. On the Continent, again, friction between Prussia and France had grown so strong as to reach the point of rupture. After Austerlitz, Napoleon offered Hanover to Prussia, but in the course of the British negotiations it was stated that Britain should recover possession of this province. This apparent treachery, the presence of the Grand Army in Germany, and the creation of the confederacy of the Rhine stirred a strong war party

European History

in Prussia to action. The nation cried aloud for war with France, and the army, remembering the triumphs of Frederick the Great, was full of confidence in the issue. Unfortunately the army was no longer the perfect machine that Frederick had made it, and the manœuvres which that great commander had successfully employed had been replaced by Napoleon's new strategy. In the battles of Jena and Auerstadt, fought on 14 October, 1806, the Prussians were overwhelmed, their military reputation vanished, their incompetent generals surrendered fortresses without an attempt at defence, and the French triumphantly entered Berlin. In a month Napoleon had shattered the power which for seven years had held out against the combined forces of Europe. Meanwhile the Russian army, which the Tsar Alexander had sent to support Frederick William, was advancing upon the line of the Vistula. Upon a stormy February day in 1807 Napoleon attacked them at Eylau. A fearful scene of carnage took place, and the result may be described as indecisive. But in the summer of the same year the Russians were completely routed at Friedland. The Tsar was obliged to sue for peace. At Tilsit a series of interviews took place concerning the partition of the Western world. The old empires of the east and west were to be revived. France was to be supreme over Europe and the Latin races, while Russia was to represent the Greek empire and expand into Asia. Prussia lost her provinces west of the Elbe, and her possessions in Poland. A new kingdom of Westphalia was provided for Napoleon's youngest brother, Jérôme. Prussian Poland was given to Saxony, and Prussia lost half of her territory, was forced to pay a crushing indemnity, and was reduced to the rank of a third-rate power. In no case was the true character of Napoleon's administration more clearly shown than in that of Poland. The Poles had fought in Napoleon's army with courage and devotion, waiting until he should unite and restore their nation. If ever there was a case in which the principles of the French Revolution could righteously have been carried out, it was here. But in order to avoid a clashing of personal interests with the Tsar, Napoleon agreed to a partition which violated every principle of justice and equity. The whole arrangement, in short, was as unstatesmanlike as it could possibly have been. Saxony and Poland could have no real chance against Prussia, which had been steadily growing for two centuries, and was not likely to relapse into decay at a moment. The power of the empire was weakened by extending it to the Elbe and Vistula. Like the Assyrian empires of old, it was becoming a mere congeries of subject kingdoms, united by the loosest of ties, while the whole arrangement depended upon the assumption that the Tsar and Napoleon would remain upon friendly terms, that the imperial champion of the French Revolution would live at peace with the representative of the aristocratic monarchy of the past. And, as if this were not enough, Napoleon devised another plan for disorganizing the arrangements he had made.

After the Peace of Tilsit, Britain was the only enemy remaining.



FRIEDLAND IN 1807

From the painting by J. L. E. Meissonier

Napoleon

Napoleon, incapable of injuring her by sea, determined to do so on the Continent. He closed all the ports against British ships, and forbade any European nation to maintain relations of any kind with Great Britain. Ships trading with England were open to capture; British subjects, wherever found, were to be made prisoners of war. The British replied to these measures by orders decreeing that vessels trading from ports whence British ships were excluded by Napoleon could be captured as prizes, a regulation which contributed to involve Britain in war with the United States. But apart from this, and though individual traders suffered heavily, Britain, as a whole, benefited by Napoleon's measures, which are generally known as the Continental System. The blockade could not be made effective, because Napoleon had no fleet worth mentioning. Hence large quantities of British goods were smuggled into foreign ports and sold at higher prices than they would have made in the ordinary course of commerce. No measure could have been more disastrous to Napoleon himself. The commerce of Continental states was ruinously affected, and nowhere was indignation more intense at the enforcement of the system than in Russia. These measures practically implied the overthrow of the Treaty of Tilsit, with its grandiose designs, and Napoleon turned a weapon against himself which resulted in his destruction. The immediate consequence, as far as England was concerned, was the seizure of the Danish fleet at Copenhagen, in which operations Wellington took some small share. The Portuguese Government had attempted to evade the operation of the Continental system, which fact was made the excuse for the invasion of the country. The royal family sailed for Brazil, Spain was also appropriated, and Wellington began his operations in the Peninsula. Before Napoleon took the field in Spain in person he had a meeting with the Tsar Alexander at Erfurt, not far from Jena, which may be regarded as marking the culmination of his career in point of splendour and magnificence. Four vassal kings, scores of princes and ambassadors, men of letters and poets appeared in the train of the conqueror. Goethe himself discussed French tragedy with Napoleon, who brought a company of actors from Paris to represent the masterpieces of French tragedy to the royal audiences. Alexander was allowed to keep Finland and the Danubian provinces of the sultan, in return for which he promised to secure the Austrian submission and enforce the Continental blockade, while Napoleon was occupied in Spain.

Napoleon succeeded in placing his brother Joseph upon the throne in Madrid, but the harassing warfare of the guerrilla force of Spaniards, the defence of Saragossa, and the approach of Sir John Moore involved him in difficulties, and before the campaign was over he was obliged to leave Soult to deal with Moore and to return to Paris. Austria had seized the opportunity to renew her alliance with Britain, upon noting the emperor's difficulties in Spain, the rising agitation in Germany, and the revolt of her lost province of Tyrol against Bavaria; the Archduke Charles had reorganized the army upon a national basis, and the

country was eager to avenge the humiliation of Austerlitz. "The waters of Lethe, and not the waters of the Danube," said Napoleon, "must wash the walls of Vienna." The campaign of 1809 again shattered Austria's hopes. The battle of Aspern and Essling was a reverse, and that of Wagram a defeat. Austria was again forced to accept humiliating terms, to give large tracts of territory to Bavaria, and to surrender her Illyrian provinces to Napoleon. He thus had practical control by land of the European coastline from the Turkish frontier on the Adriatic to the Russian frontier on the Baltic.

In 1810 Napoleon divorced his wife, Josephine, in order to marry the Archduchess Marie Louise of Austria. Josephine had no children and Napoleon felt the reproach of his humble origin, which might be removed by an alliance with one of the most ancient families in Europe, while he was also anxious to leave an heir to his imperial throne. In the following year a son was born, who received the title of king of Rome. The Emperor Francis, by his consent to this marriage, disqualified himself for the position of leader in the coming war of liberation; the distinction and credit of that position was taken by Prussia. Meanwhile a dispute had broken out between Napoleon and the Pope. The Pope declined to enforce the Continental system, and supported the Bourbon princes and Naples, refusing to arrange a Concordat in the kingdom of Italy. Napoleon marched an army into the Papal States, declared the Pope to be no longer a secular prince, and added Rome to all his dominions in the Italian kingdom. Pius VII replied by excommunicating Napoleon, who was not greatly moved, and held him a state prisoner for some three years. He had some thoughts of assuming himself the supremacy over ecclesiastical government, and uniting in his own person the supreme power in Church and State. He called a great Church Council to settle ecclesiastical affairs and to examine the possibility of his own ecclesiastical supremacy. The Pope was induced to fill vacant bishoprics in the interests of the Church, but Napoleon could extract nothing more from the council, which was obviously hostile to his ideas of Church government. In the same year Napoleon incorporated Holland with the French empire upon the abdication of his brother, Louis, who declined to maintain the Continental system, which was ruining the Dutch trade. For the same purpose Napoleon annexed the German coastline, including the old Hanseatic towns, and his empire had reached its greatest extent. From Lubeck, in northern Germany, to Rome, France was supreme. The Netherlands, part of western and north-western Germany, the Illyrian provinces, and the Ionian islands were all directly under Napoleon's sway. Austria and Prussia were completely subjected to him; Naples and Westphalia and the vassal princes of central Germany were mere dependencies of his empire. Joseph Bonaparte was on the throne of Spain, and since the time of Charlemagne no one ruler had controlled so vast an extent of territory. Napoleon had 900,000 men under arms. The art treasures of Europe had been sent to Paris, and the capital had been decorated

Napoleon

by such new and beautiful buildings as the Madeleine and the column of Austerlitz. Large sums had been expended upon improvements and fortifications in many important towns. Fine roads had been constructed across the Alps, a great system of canals linked together the rivers of France, and there was apparent peace and harmony within the country. All republican independence had disappeared with the last vestiges of republican parties, though the Senate had the right of imposing taxes and some show of authority. Many old nobles had returned to the country; some had become useful servants of the empire. Napoleon believed, and many believed with him, that the new foundation rested upon a strong and permanent basis and that he would hand it down unimpaired to his son and successor.

Magnificent as the empire outwardly appeared, those who had eyes to see could already discern the elements of decay and prophesy a complete dissolution. The structure depended solely upon the life of one man, whose genius had brought it together, and between the several parts of it there was no cohesion or unity. The Continental system had caused the greatest exasperation wherever it had been seriously enforced, and had sapped the material resources of France. Marseilles and Bordeaux were almost ruined, while the emperor's conscriptions had despoiled the country of her best and most capable men. The soldiers of Austerlitz were struggling in Spain, and the new armies were chiefly composed of young and untrained recruits, or of lukewarm auxiliaries. The Catholic clergy and their adherents had been alienated by Napoleon's treatment of the Pope, while numbers of French *émigrés* and dispossessed rulers from other states were watching for an opportunity to regain what they had lost. The emperor's rule had become a mere despotism; the Senate and Legislature merely recorded his decrees or flattered his conceit. False and ruinous principles of finance were introduced, and ministers who ventured to object or to oppose them were summarily dismissed from office. Those who had welcomed Napoleon as the embodiment of the ideas of equality and liberty were ready to denounce him as a tyrant. His formation of a court and the favour which he showed to nobles of the old *régime*, his attempt to create an hereditary aristocracy and his marriage with one of the old families of Europe, had turned many of his early adherents into bitter enemies. The powers which he had deemed most closely bound to his interests were actually working against him. Austria, Prussia, and Russia were in a state of continual fear and apprehension, while Britain, triumphant and secure in her insular position, and growing in wealth and strength, was ever ready to become the centre and the paymaster of any new coalition. The very customs and language of Napoleon's court showed that the empire had failed to take root in the country. The pomp and magnificence of the Tuilleries had never been surpassed in French history. Ceremonial and display were organized with the attention which the emperor gave to every matter of detail, but the general effect of the whole

was tawdry and vulgar; and those who heard the ridicule of the exiled nobles who had known the splendours of the old *régime*, could not fail to think that their criticisms were unanswerable. Moreover, while Napoleon had previously fought against a despotism founded upon privilege and dependent upon aristocratic sympathies, he was now to encounter a force of which he had no experience except in support of himself, the strength of nationalism.

After the surrender of Ulm, when Austria had been defeated for the second time, some friends expressed the opinion to the British minister, Pitt, that Napoleon was invincible upon land. To this Pitt replied that Napoleon would not receive a check until he met with a national resistance. Such a resistance he would find in Spain, and Britain would then intervene; a prophecy which Lord Acton has characterized as the most astounding and profound prediction in all political history. The violent outburst in Spain which Wellington was able to guide and support was now repeated, though upon far different methods and with far more striking results, in Prussia. Before the battle of Jena, Germany had been the home of individualism. No greater contrast in national aspirations is to be found than the addresses delivered by Fichte to the German nation and the contemplative attitude of the philosopher Hegel. The latter thinker was living in Jena at the very moment when Prussia was beaten to the ground by Napoleon; but only twenty-four hours later did he casually learn of the event. Goethe and Lessing were unable to understand the true meaning of patriotism, and so long as the several states of Germany were ruled by dynasties, were disunited among themselves, and concerned only with the preservation of their aristocratic privileges, no appeal to patriotism could have been successful. But the progress of education; the movement led by Fichte, which brought about the foundation of the university of Berlin in 1810; the patriotic songs of poets like Arndt, Körner, and others, created a new spirit in Prussian society, which was fostered by the great economic reforms carried out by the statesmen Stein and Hardenberg. Stein had realized that the strength of the state depended upon the interest of its people and its welfare, and in 1807 he secured the issue of the famous Decree of Emancipation, which abolished the serfdom under which two-thirds of the inhabitants had lain. Other class privileges and distinctions were abolished; towns were given the power of local self-government as a preparation for representation in the national assemblies. Meanwhile the minister of war, Scharnhorst, was reorganizing the army. The force which Napoleon had beaten at Jena was composed of peasants brought together by conscription, and officered by incompetent aristocrats. Scharnhorst produced an army based upon the principle of universal military service, the units of which felt that they were fighting not for the interests of others but for their self-preservation. Even Napoleon's supervision was unable to check this progress, which proceeded with magical rapidity. When he detected the aims of Stein's policy he forced Frederick William to dismiss him,

NAPOLEON I AND HIS STAFF. From the painting by J. L. E. Meissonier in the Wallace Collection, London.

Jean Louis Ernest Meissonier was born at Lyons in 1815 and died at Paris in 1891. He is the most notable "small master" of France, his works being characterized by perfection of finish. In military pictures his reputation stands high, among his best works of this class being several depicting scenes in the career of the two Napoleons, I and III. The best known of these is, perhaps, his "1814", showing the great Napoleon on his retreat from Leipzig. The date of the present picture is 1863. Another of Meissonier's works reproduced in this volume, "Friedland in 1807", occupied ten years in painting, so careful of detail and finish was the artist.

Napoleon

but Hardenberg was no less efficient. Napoleon limited the Prussian army to 42,000 men, and, though Scharnhorst never kept more than that number upon a war footing at any one time, a continual succession of mobilized regiments enabled him to make military training universal. The dramatic uprising of Prussia in the war of liberation was made possible by years of careful preparation which had regenerated the spirit of the people and prepared them to meet the new emergency.

The invasion of Russia provided their opportunity. The interests of Napoleon and the Tsar had obviously been incompatible even from the Peace of Tilsit, and the Continental system had enormously increased the friction between them. Napoleon's most recent annexations had roused the alarm of the Tsar, and a strong anti-French party was predominant in St. Petersburg. So early as 1811 Napoleon resolved to invade the country. He made the most elaborate preparations for this gigantic enterprise. Immense depots of provisions were formed between the Elbe and Vistula, thousands of transport wagons were built, fortresses on the line of march were strongly occupied, a conscription was levied in France, the contingents of the Rhine confederates were called out, and large bodies of troops were withdrawn from Spain. Yet these preparations were so carefully veiled that the Tsar did not realize the emperor's intentions until the spring of 1812. To meet Napoleon's 400,000 men the Tsar had only gathered 250,000; but the Russian leader opposed to him, Barclay, an able man, gradually retreated, wasting the country as he went. By the time Napoleon had reached the River Dwina he learnt that 150,000 of his invading force were missing, either from disease, desertion, or loss in skirmishes, though no pitched battle had been fought. At Smolensk the Russians made a stand, and after a bloody and indecisive struggle they reduced the town to ashes and again retreated, Barclay joining hands with Bagration, the commander of the Russian southern army. Napoleon was urged by his generals to remain at Smolensk, to go into winter quarters and secure his hold of the adjoining provinces. But Napoleon was convinced that the capture of Moscow would bring peace, and insisted on an advance. In the last week of August he left Smolensk with the best part of the Grand Army, some 160,000 men. The Russians again retreated, leaving a desert behind them. But they were themselves weary of these Fabian tactics, and Barclay, who had pursued this careful strategy, was replaced by Kutussoff, a veteran of 1805, who undertook to offer battle. The result was the frightful conflict of the Borodino, which cost the lives of between 70,000 and 80,000 men. The Russians, though driven back, were not defeated; yet on 14 September, 1812, the Grand Army was able to enter Moscow. Napoleon found the city, to his surprise, deserted by the inhabitants, and a series of successive conflagrations reduced the greater part of the capital to ashes in the course of a week. Still the emperor, with obstinate confidence, clung to the illusion that the Tsar would submit. But after weeks of silence had passed, when the army had been con-

siderably reduced by disease and exhaustion, when Kutusoff was receiving steady successions of reinforcements, Napoleon realized the situation. He vainly attempted to persuade his marshals to march upon St. Petersburg, and in the middle of October he was reluctantly obliged to give the order for retreat. The tragedy which followed is too well known to need description. The failure of supplies, the sudden advent of a terrible Russian winter, the ravages of the Cossack light horse, and the progress of disease reduced his army with appalling rapidity. When he reached Smolensk in the second week in November he commanded only 40,000 fugitives, without order or discipline, who sacked the great magazines which he had formed at that town with the desperate fear of famine-stricken men. There was no stopping at Smolensk; the Tsar had made peace with Britain and the Turks, and a Russian force was advancing from the south. The army again set forth, and the scenes of the previous march were repeated. Had it not been for the heroism of Ney, who covered the retreat with indefatigable energy, hardly a man would have escaped. Horror reached its climax when the Grand Army heard that the two Russian commanders had joined hands upon the Beresina, and were barring their retreat. Napoleon, with admirable skill, contrived to deceive the enemy and throw two bridges over the river. The passage was secured, though at the loss of thousands of lives. Cold and privation continued, and the spectres of the Grand Army who reached Germany horrified the inhabitants by their appearance. Their feet bound in filthy rags, with uniforms of the most nondescript description, many of them clad in the skins of animals which they had killed, they crawled westward like ghosts, in misery that appealed even to their bitterest enemies. They ate with such voracity that the legend long survived among the Prussian peasantry that they had been cursed with insatiable hunger because in time of plenty they had wastefully thrown bread into their camp fires. The numbers that started and returned from this campaign have never been correctly ascertained, but of the half-million of men who crossed the Russian frontier a few months before, probably not 80,000 were ever again fit for military service. The disaster was undoubtedly due to Napoleon's overconfidence. The Grand Army was not the army which he had commanded in the days of his first consulship, and from it he demanded the impossible. The whole plan of campaign was brilliant in conception and was carefully carried out, but a system of war which was practicable in western Europe was hardly possible in the wilds of Russia. His movements, to be successful, depended upon their rapidity. In Russia he found no good roads, while the enormous stores which he was obliged to carry about with him greatly impeded his movements. Had he never crossed the Russian frontier his empire would none the less have fallen, but the disaster of 1812 gave his enemies heart to close upon him for the final struggle.

Towards the end of December, 1812, Napoleon was again in Paris, making enormous efforts to restore his military power. But the horizon

looked very black, and the whole of Prussia rose against him; Austria could not be trusted, while Britain was naturally in the forefront of the movement. The emperor anticipated the conscription of 1814 and further weakened the armies in Spain, strengthened his cavalry by the enlistment of men from the wealthier class in France, and in the spring of 1813 had actually raised his forces, including his allies, to the extraordinary total of 400,000 men, who were concentrated between the Rhine and the Vistula. Weary of his despotism as it was, the country understood that the approaching struggle was one for existence, and the nation poured forth its resources with loyal lavishness in order to retain its military supremacy. In May, 1813, Napoleon had defeated the allied armies of the Russians and Prussians at Lützen, where Gustavus Adolphus had fallen, and at Bautzen. The Austrians then turned against him. He had attempted to bribe Austria with the offer of Silesia, but Metternich, while ostensibly gathering an army to join the emperor, was secretly negotiating with the allies. When it appeared that Austria would hold the balance between Napoleon and his enemies, he offered to act as mediator for terms of peace. His offers, under the circumstances, were magnificent. France would have been left with more than her natural boundaries; but Napoleon, infuriated at what he deemed the bad faith of Austria, attempted to detach Prussia and the Tsar from her alliance. They, however, refused to negotiate. Napoleon thereupon signed an armistice on 4 June in the hope of gaining time to strengthen the weakness of his forces, which had become painfully apparent, especially in respect of cavalry. The diplomatic situation was, however, precipitated by the news of Wellington's successes in Spain, and as Napoleon thought his preparations were complete he denounced the armistice on 10 August, and prepared to confront overwhelming forces. The allies had 500,000 men in the field and 300,000 reserves, and Napoleon, who had thought that the Prussian assistance would be limited to the 42,000 to which he had restricted them, was startled to learn that her contingent had amounted to 200,000 men.

Napoleon had resolved to occupy the line of the Elbe, and had seized all the fords and fortresses from the Bohemian frontier to Hamburg; but by the middle of September he realized that his resources were not equal to so extensive a strategical plan. The allied manœuvres were directed to forcing a battle at Leipzig, but Napoleon, divining this intention, attempted to strike at Blücher and the Prussians before they could reach the allies. The brilliant strategy which dictated this plan was suddenly frustrated by the defection of Bavaria. A great national rising had absorbed the Rhine confederation, Jérôme's kingdom of Westphalia had fallen, and Napoleon's communications with France were endangered. The allies secured their object, and forced the French to concentrate upon Leipzig. The resulting Battle of the Nations, which lasted three days, ended in Napoleon's defeat. As usual, he had played for all or nothing. The attempt to defend the long line of the Elbe was a possible plan with competent troops, but it

European History

was not possible for the French army in 1813. He had underrated the strength of the forces against him and the spirit which animated them. On his return to France, news of disaster came in from every quarter. The Austrians had been victorious in Italy, Wellington and the British were crossing the Pyrenees, the Swedes were advancing through the Netherlands, and a powerful allied army was advancing from the Rhine. Napoleon made heroic efforts to roll back the tide of invasion. The difficult manœuvre of operating between two converging armies was brilliantly devised by him, but he had not the strength or the mobility to carry it out with sufficient decision to check the advance of the enemy. By 31 March, 1814, Paris surrendered. The French Senate, inspired by Talleyrand, issued a proclamation deposing the emperor and restoring the Bourbons. Napoleon's servants informed him that his troops were weary of war and were unwilling to fight. Marmont went over to the allies, and on 6 April, 1814, the emperor abdicated. The chief aspiration of Frenchmen as a whole was a longing for repose. The survivors of the old *régime* and the royalists were naturally delighted. Napoleon sat for a time at Fontainebleau, amid the ruins of the empire he had created. He felt that life was an intolerable burden, and, like Hannibal, attempted suicide; but the poison which he swallowed did not prove fatal, and soon afterwards he was on his way to the Island of Elba, which the allies had given him. From the tears and lamentations of his veteran Guard, from whom he parted at Fontainebleau, he passed to the curses and execrations of southern France, which had been ruined by the conscription and the Continental system, and thence to the narrow island in the Mediterranean and the administration of a petty realm.

The Bourbons, during their years of exile, "had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing". Louis XVIII was under the influence of favourites who were simply desirous of restoring the old *régime*. Hordes of partisans and place-seekers were demanding favours. Ruined émigrés were claiming the restitution of their lands and property, and peasants who had bought these estates from the State were terrified at the prospect of deprivation. Multitudes of soldiers were returning to France, liberated from outlying fortresses or set free from military captivity, and to disband these exasperated masses, who retained their enthusiasm for Napoleon, was a task of danger and difficulty. A conciliatory and tactful Government would have had much difficulty in restoring peace and confidence, but Louis XVIII apparently went out of his way to outrage the cherished sympathies of the nation. The imperial eagles were taken away, the Old Guard was forbidden to approach the king's person and was replaced by a body of young nobles who had never seen a battlefield. Louis styled himself King of France and Navarre by the grace of God. He alluded to 1814 as his nineteenth regnal year, affecting complete oblivion of the republic and the empire and of his days of exile. The subordinate place which France held among the great powers, and the arrangements which were made at the Congress of Vienna for the distribution of her spoils,

increased the national irritation, in spite of the clever and successful diplomacy of Talleyrand. Rumours began to go about that Napoleon would return with the spring violets. The wish, no doubt, was father to the rumour; but Napoleon, at Elba, had realized the possibility.

In March, 1815, the Congress of Vienna heard, first with incredulity and then with horror, of his return. His call to the army and to the nation to rally to his cause was answered with wonderful enthusiasm. By the time he had reached Paris, on 20 March, his army was 20,000 strong. Louis XVIII and his bodyguard of nobles fled to the frontier. But, apart from the military element, the nation had no real confidence in Napoleon. He knew that an appeal for a general rising would have failed, nor did he even make use of the conscription of 1815. He did, however, reorganize all the elements of military power which he found in France. The exact figures will always remain doubtful, but by the middle of June he must have had over 200,000 soldiers ready for service; and the equipment of these, the procuring of munitions of war, and the preparations for their transport and other necessary details were an extraordinary feat of organization in view of the then state of France. His effort failed at Waterloo, and Napoleon escaped from the fury of Blücher to take refuge on the British warship *Bellerophon*, for eventual banishment to St. Helena. The British assumed the responsibility for his transport, and guarded him closely until his death. His exile was spent in the compilation of Memoirs and Reminiscences, and his companions in exile, such as Las Cases, have their place in history. His life was unhappy; the governor of the island, Sir Hudson Lowe, was a man of no great tact, and was not greatly concerned to avoid friction with his illustrious prisoner. By the close of 1820 it was obvious that the emperor's death was approaching. He had long suffered from two distressing maladies; indeed his health on many occasions seemed to have impaired his strategy, and had he been the decisive warrior of Marengo he might have fought Waterloo with a different result. On 5 May, 1821, he died after much suffering. He was buried upon the island, eventually to be carried back to France, under Louis Philippe, to lie beneath the dome of the Invalides.

Innumerable portraits have made his face familiar, but no description can do justice to his abilities. With an extraordinary power of imagination, directed by a scientific and calculating mind, from which the smallest detail never escaped, and engineered by marvellous self-confidence and an indefatigable energy and ambition, he was a man who would have risen to eminence in any age and in any occupation. As a warrior he was the first great master of extensive military combinations. In the difficult tasks of striking at the communications in the rear of an enemy, of crushing an opposing force in detail, or manoeuvring between them when defeated, he was unequalled; and the originality of his designs was only paralleled by the audacity of their execution. On the other hand, his extraordinary confidence in himself and his powerful imagination sometimes overwhelmed his judgment. The Russian campaign would have been deemed impos-

sible by him in 1799, nor was he willing to admit his ignorance of the conditions under which naval warfare was carried on. He was no less great as a ruler. He found France panic-stricken by defeat and torn by anarchy: he gave her a strong and competent Government, did much to reconcile class hatred, and provided a new basis upon which the nation could grow after the frenzy of the Revolution had spent itself. French institutions and French social order were almost permanently modelled by his legislation; but, on the other hand, he had a considerable contempt for the opinions of mankind in the mass, and the success of his Government is partly due to the fact that when he came to power Frenchmen were not particularly anxious to secure political rights for themselves, nor, indeed, at that time, were they capable of political liberty.

The theory that the empire which he created grew automatically, that he was led from conquest to conquest by the force of events, will not bear examination. With his gifts he found the Continent easy to overrun, and he proceeded also to subjugate it when he became the uncontrolled despot of France. His ambition became his ruin, and his faith in his genius deceived him. Had it been otherwise he would never have deemed that a supremacy raised in defiance of history, law, and treaties could ever become permanent. At the same time many of the calumnies that have been heaped upon him in England and elsewhere are sheer exaggerations. The terror which his name inspired led men to describe him as a combination of Nero and Attila, recklessly careless of human life and selfishly licentious. If he did much harm he also did much good. Feudalism would never have been as completely overthrown as it was between the Rhine and the Vistula if Napoleon had not led his armies across these districts. Nor could any man be entirely bad who exerted so strong a fascination upon those about him. The memoirs of the time are full of anecdotes illustrating the devotion of his soldiers. By them he was idolized, in spite of the fact that he was prodigal of human life in the pursuit of his ambitious purposes, and the tears of the Old Guard when he left them at Fontainebleau form the best of testimonies to the magnetism of his personality.

CHAPTER VII

Nelson (A.D. 1758-1805)

Horatio Nelson was born on 29 September, 1758, at a critical period in Britain's history. The tide was just on the turn in the course of the Seven Years' War, and next year Wolfe captured Quebec, Boscawen destroyed the French Mediterranean fleet off Lagos, while Hawke defeated the French fleet at Quiberon Bay. Nelson's father was rector of Burnham Thorpe, Norfolk; his mother was a sister of Captain Suckling, who came with credit out of a little skirmish with the French in the West Indies in 1757, when he commanded the *Dreadnought*. Suckling had offered to provide for one of his many nephews, and Horatio, through his own importunities, was able to seize this opening for entrance to the navy. He was a boy of weak health and fragile build, and apparently as unsuitable a candidate for the hardships of a naval life in those days as could well be found. His uncle sent him to the West Indies in a merchantman to learn navigation and seamanship, and two years later, when he was fourteen and a half, secured him a berth upon a small polar expedition projected by the Government, in the course of which Nelson had his well-known adventure with the bear. Another peace expedition took him to India, but the climate did not suit his health and he was invalided home. In 1775 he passed his lieutenant's examination; his uncle was controller of the navy, and Nelson was appointed to a frigate for service in the West Indies in the course of the American War. By 1778 he had become commander of a brig, and in 1780, when the Spaniards had begun to take part in the war, he joined an expedition directed by the governor of Jamaica against Central America. The unwholesome climate made the attempt a failure, and Nelson was again invalided home in the autumn of 1780 in a very precarious condition. Upon his recovery he was sent to the West Indies, and in 1783 the war was ended by the Peace of Versailles, and Nelson was home again. He then received a peace command to the Leeward Islands, and was married in 1787 to Mrs. Nisbet, a young widow. For the next five years he was on shore, living a quiet country life at the parsonage where he was born, Burnham Thorpe.

When the war of the French Revolution broke out in 1793 he secured an appointment to the *Agamemnon*, his first and favourite battleship. The *Agamemnon* was attached to the Mediterranean fleet under Lord Hood, who occupied Toulon in the name of Louis XVII. Had Lord

Hood been allowed to remove the numerous warships which thronged the harbour the struggle might soon have come to an end, but royalist prejudice and Spanish jealousy forbade any such action. He was well aware that his insignificant landing party of 15,000 men could not guard 15 miles of fortifications against the attacks which would certainly be made upon him. Nelson was therefore dispatched to the court of Naples to ask for reinforcements. Queen Maria Carolina, the sister of the unfortunate Marie Antoinette, was the life and soul of the royalist party in Naples, and her chief friend was Lady Hamilton, wife of the British ambassador. Nelson's arrival was enthusiastically greeted; 16,000 troops and transports were immediately prepared for Toulon. These, however, were quite inadequate to garrison the town, and when Bonaparte brought his genius to bear upon the siege the end was not long delayed. Lord Hood succeeded in rescuing many of the royalist townspeople, but a large number for whom he had not room on board were captured and massacred by the Jacobins.

Hood then resolved upon the conquest of Corsica. Britain's nearest base of operations was Gibraltar, as Minorca had been lost during the Seven Years' War, a transaction to be remembered in connection with the execution of Byng. The three fortresses which the French held in the island were captured by the end of 1794, largely through the zeal of Nelson in directing the land operations. He was badly wounded in the course of them by a splinter from the parapet of his battery, which struck him in the face, and eventually destroyed the sight of his right eye. Hood went home for reasons of health, and his command was taken over by Admiral Hotham, an admirable second-in-command but a man with no initiative. On 10 March, 1795, his carelessness enabled the French fleet to leave Toulon and sail for Corsica, presumably with the object of recapturing the island. On observing the disposition of the British fleet they retired. One vessel, the *Ca Ira*, ran into her neighbour, damaged her rigging, and began to lag behind. Nelson, in the *Agamemnon*, who happened to be nearest, immediately engaged her. The French *Censeur* turned back to her support, and when Hotham came up with the rest of his fleet the two ships were captured. Nelson was greatly disappointed; he thought that it might have been possible to engage the enemy in force, and that more should have been done. His spirits revived in 1795, when Hotham resigned, and was succeeded by Admiral Sir John Jervis.

Jervis had been brought up in the hardest of hard schools. He had gone to sea against his father's will, who declined to make him any allowance, and had been reduced to great privation in the lower grades of the service. He made his name by his clever handling of the *Foudroyant*, a swift man-o'-war captured from the French, and his action on the West Indian command, when he speedily reduced Martinique, Guadalupe, and Santa Lucia, displayed his first-rate abilities. He was a stern and unyielding martinet, but his regulations made for efficiency. And nowhere was efficiency more needed than

in the Mediterranean. Britain and Austria were now fighting France alone, and the slackness of Hotham had allowed the French to maintain communication by sea with Italy. The alliance between Spain and France raised the French naval forces to forty battleships, while Jervis had but fifteen. Corsica was useless as a naval base owing to the relentless hostility of the population, and in 1796 the admiralty resolved to abandon the Mediterranean and fall back upon Gibraltar. Thus forty hostile ships were set at liberty which might have joined the French fleet at Brest, and so have provided a naval strength for that invasion of England which the Directory were already planning.

Jervis lost five of his fleet in a storm, and was obliged to take shelter in Lisbon. The Government sent him reinforcements, which brought his fleet up to its original strength, and ordered him to cruise off Cape St. Vincent to intercept the Spanish Mediterranean fleet which was summoned to Brest. The Spaniards were ordered to call at Cadiz, and not to attempt the passage in a single run. After passing the Straits of Gibraltar they were carried far out into the Atlantic. They might have run straight for Brest, but in obedience to their orders they proceeded to beat up for Cadiz, and Nelson, who was returning from a mission to the Island of Elba, actually ran into the middle of them, and escaped capture by a miracle, on his way to rejoin Jervis. His escape was aided by a thick fog, and when this rose the next morning twenty-seven formidable Spanish ships were observed steering eastward for Cadiz, to which Jervis could oppose fifteen. His fleet, however, was in first-rate order, whereas the Spaniards, who expected no attack, were in some small confusion.

The rules which governed naval tactics in Nelson's day have been totally superseded by the use of steam. It was a universal rule that fleets preparing to fight a naval engagement should be in line-ahead formation—that is, in Indian file—for in no other position could every ship make the utmost use of its guns. For the same reason each commanding admiral strove to keep his line parallel with that of his opponent, otherwise the opponent could bring an overwhelming fire to bear upon any portion of his line before his own broadsides could reply. Actions, as a rule, were fought in motion, but Nelson engaged in at least two at anchor. The fleets were drawn up close-hauled, as near to the wind as possible, in which position one or other of them was necessarily bound to have the advantage known as the weather gauge. Suppose, that is, the fleet were sailing in line-ahead formation westward with the wind at north, they would then be advancing on the starboard tack; an enemy's fleet to the south in parallel formation would occupy the leeward position; if farther to the north, the enemy's fleet would occupy the windward position or have the weather gauge. The fleet that secured this advantage was able to decide at what moment the conflict should begin, while the wind would also drive the smoke out of their eyes down upon the enemy. On the other hand, in order to begin the attack the fleet thus situated was obliged to bear up—that is, to form line abreast, and to move within range

of the enemy's guns, during which time they were exposed to the full broadside of the enemy and incapable of inflicting any damage themselves. As soon as they had chosen their distance they turned to line ahead and brought their own guns to bear, or, in nautical language, hauled their wind. Generally speaking, as the British preferred the weather gauge, so the French preferred the windward position. They hoped while the British were bearing up to be able to damage their spars, and then to outmanoeuvre them when their sailing power had thus been diminished. For the most part, actions were usually trials of endurance and gunnery. Given the fact that both forces were equally skilful in manoeuvring, and gifted with equal speed, little could be done in the way of tactics during the actual course of an engagement.

Off Cape St. Vincent the Spaniards were not only not in line-ahead formation, but were actually separated into two squadrons. An unpremeditated gap was to be observed between their fastest vessels at the head of the procession and a larger body in the rear. Jervis immediately leapt at this weak point. If he could throw his ships between the two divisions of the Spanish forces, he would cut their line and be able to turn upon either section that he pleased. When he was between them, he was obliged to attack the larger and more backward division of the enemy which had the wind of him. The attempt of the rearmost ships to seize the weather gauge, sail past Jervis, and rejoin the foremost squadron was frustrated by the vigilance of Nelson, who left his place unordered and engaged the admiral's ship. He was supported by his friend, Trowbridge, and was eventually successful in forcing the *San Nicolas* to surrender by boarding her from his own vessel. On the other side of the *San Nicolas* was a still larger vessel, the *San Josef*. Nelson therefore led his boarders from the *San Nicolas* to the decks of this new enemy, and thus captured two huge prizes with his own inferior ship. When Nelson met Jervis he may have felt some misgivings as to the results of his action in leaving his place without orders, but Jervis embraced him before the ship's company, and recognized that his action had completed the victory. Jervis had four prizes, and he had reduced at least ten more vessels to sheer hulls. He had completely defeated and scattered a force twice as numerous as his own, and had averted the danger of a junction between the French and Spanish fleets. Jervis received the title of Lord St. Vincent, while Nelson's exploits were in every mouth. None the less, twenty-three ships still remained in Cadiz, and the new Lord St. Vincent hoped that he might be able to entice them to their destruction. He therefore applied for reinforcements. These he received, but the naval power of the State had been greatly shaken by the great naval mutiny, and the Government got rid of several disaffected vessels by sending them to Jervis and the blockade of Cadiz. Jervis speedily reduced the malcontents to order and placed Nelson on board the *Theseus*, a vessel of the worst reputation, as his own ship, the *Captain*, had been too badly damaged in the recent action to keep the sea.

Nelson not only checked the smouldering spirit of discontent on board, but speedily won the affection and loyalty of every member of the ship's company.

From Cadiz, at his own suggestion, he was sent to Teneriffe, where it was thought that the viceroy of Mexico might have landed with a large cargo of treasure from Spanish America. His attempt to capture the fort of Santa Cruz by a night attack was a failure. The position was a strong one, and he could not provide the landing party necessary for success. After much loss he was beaten off, and lost an arm in the action, by a grape shot which shattered his elbow. Nelson was prepared to take all responsibility for the failure upon his own shoulders. It in no way interfered with the general scheme of operations, and need not have been undertaken at all. But Lord St. Vincent would not admit that Nelson had lost anything in reputation, but had rather added further laurels to his fame by so gallant an attempt in the face of overwhelming forces. When he had recovered from his wound he hoisted his flag in the first vessel that was ready, the *Vanguard*. On April 9, 1798, he was able to sail, and when he reached Cadiz, Lord St. Vincent sent him into the Mediterranean to discover the meaning of the extensive preparations which he had heard were being made at Toulon.

Napoleon had now overwhelmed the Austrians, and Britain was practically his sole antagonist. The Directory were anxious to proceed with their plans for the invasion of Britain, but Napoleon, after carefully examining their projects, pronounced the scheme impossible for the moment. He had been brooding over an even more ambitious enterprise. He proposed to make the Mediterranean a French lake, to seize Malta, and occupy Egypt, whence he would be able to menace British commerce and secure a base for future operations upon India. Fifteen warships, fourteen frigates, fifty smaller vessels, and four hundred transports were assembled at Toulon. Preparations were made to embark 36,000 troops. Not only soldiers and sailors but also astronomers, historians, antiquarians, mineralogists, and cartographers were prepared to accompany the expedition. Nelson informed Lord St. Vincent of these facts, but he was unable to tell him what most of the French staff officers themselves did not know, the destination of this formidable force. The admiralty agreed that Britain must retain a fleet in the Mediterranean, reinforcements were sent to Cadiz, and Lord St. Vincent was informed that if he preferred to stay there to supervise the blockade himself, he could place the command of the Mediterranean squadron under Sir Horatio Nelson. Nelson was already in the Mediterranean, and had suffered severely from a storm, at the time when these orders were issued. Off the island of Elba he was joined by his friend Hardy, who informed him of his new commission, and by the month of June he met the coming fleet of eleven additional ships, many of them old friends, and all inspired with the fullest confidence in their commander. The next task was to discover where the French force had gone.

Nelson put in at Naples, which was anxious to maintain its neutrality, and the ambassador, Sir William Hamilton, suggested that the French were making a raid upon Malta, and by the time Nelson was leaving the Sicilian coast he received news that this surmise was correct: Malta had fallen, after an independence which had lasted since the time when the emperor Charles V had given it to the Knights of St. John. A garrison of 4000 Frenchmen had been left, and the rest of the force had disappeared. Where it had gone no one knew. People at home expected a raid upon Plymouth Sound, or at some other point of easy access from Spain, and public opinion asserted that Nelson was too young for so important a command, that he had lost his head and was unequal to the difficulties of the situation. Nelson, however, after careful consideration of the facts, turned eastward. An army intended for England would not have been embarked at Toulon; on the other hand, 40,000 soldiers must be intended as an army of occupation somewhere. The small number of battleships showed that no hostile force was expected; operations, therefore, could hardly be intended in the Atlantic. Egypt seemed to be the only likely quarter at which Napoleon meant to strike. Nelson was not only correct, but he actually passed the French force unseen on his way to Egypt. He reached Alexandria and found the harbours empty. Had he waited a single day the French would have found him ready, but, with untiring energy, he sailed upon the Syrian coasts searching for his foe. In three weeks he was back again at Syracuse. In spite of the neutrality, combined with the difficulties of the harbour, he succeeded in provisioning and watering his vessels within five days, thanks to the influence of Lady Hamilton. Off the south coast of Greece he heard news, and on 1 August he learnt that the French were in Aboukir Bay, a recess 16 miles in width at the western mouth of the Nile delta.

Brueys, the French admiral, was not expecting the British. He knew that Nelson had visited Alexandria before him, and interpreted his hurried departure as flight. He was therefore taken by surprise. But this feeling was only momentary; if there was to be a battle the French would fight with every advantage on their side. They were at anchor, and every pair of hands could be sent to the guns. The handicap of inferior seamanship was removed, as there need be no struggle for position. By throwing out hawsers, or "springs", they could turn their ships in whichever direction they pleased upon the cables. Their rear and flanks were guarded by shoals, while batteries had been erected upon the island off Aboukir Point, which would enfilade the enemy if they ventured a frontal attack. The vulnerable point in Brueys's arrangements was his trust in the shoals to protect his rear. Nelson had taught his captains that "where there is room for a Frenchman to swing there is room for a Briton to anchor", by which he meant that if an enemy's ship had room to ride at anchor clear of a shoal, a British ship would have room to anchor and attack her. The hour was late, but Nelson was quite ready to fight in the dark. He ordered every ship to hoist a crossbar with four lanterns


swung horizontally, that they might recognize one another. Brueys had placed his heaviest ships—the *Orient*, his flagship, and others—in the centre of the line, but the English curved steadily round the southern end of their line, and five of them passed without mishap within the French formation. On the landward side the French had made no preparations, the ports were not raised and the guns were not ready for action. They had been led to suppose that if there were any fighting it would take place from the sea. They were thus caught between two fires, were battered by ships within and ships without, while those of their line who were not attacked were anchored helplessly, with sails furled, unable to move to the assistance of their fellows. The French fought bravely and vigorously, but when the *Orient* caught fire and blew up with a frightful explosion the issue of the battle was decided. With her went the spoils of Malta, £600,000, three tons of plate, and the silver gates of the cathedral. Nelson had been wounded by a shot which slashed his forehead across; but, though almost blinded, he returned from the cockpit in time to witness this final catastrophe. By three o'clock in the morning the battle was at an end; the English seamen were exhausted, and dropped asleep beside their guns. When dawn broke, Bonaparte's fleet was reduced to three ships, that turned to fly. One of them ran aground, and was set on fire by her own crew; the other two escaped to tell the tale.

It was the most complete victory that the British navy had ever won. Eighty-five per cent of the enemy's forces were destroyed or captured. The naval supremacy of the Mediterranean had passed to Britain, and Napoleon was cut off from his base. Austria and Russia prepared to rise once more against him, and the supremacy of France in Europe no longer went unchallenged. Nelson was overwhelmed with congratulations and presents. Parliament, the East India Company, and the City of London gave him pensions and gifts; the Tsar, the king of Sardinia, and the sultan of Turkey sent presents; and the fear of a French invasion of Britain was removed.

Nelson was unable to return to England for two years after the battle of the Nile. He had to prevent the return of the French from Egypt, to recapture Malta, and provide some assistance for the kingdom of Naples. Naples was passing through the same phase of the revolution which had recently disgraced Paris. The king and queen were obliged to take flight, and Nelson, with the aid of Lady Hamilton, took them on board and convoyed them to Palermo, after weathering a fearful storm. When the king was restored to his throne he conferred a dukedom on Nelson and the estate of Bronte in Sicily, valued at £3000 a year. In the course of the blockade of Malta, Nelson was able to capture one of the two ships which had escaped him at the battle of the Nile, which was attempting to convoy corn ships to the island. The last of the thirteen ships that had fought at Aboukir was subsequently captured by him in an attempt to escape from Malta by night. Nelson at this time was far from well; naturally delicate, he had borne a long and tremendous strain in the course of events antecedent and

subsequent to the battle of the Nile. In July, 1800, he obtained leave of absence and returned home. Public interest in him had in no way diminished, and the enthusiasm with which he was greeted by the crowds who flocked to see him wherever he went, seemed to restore his health almost as much as the rest and repose on shore.

At the end of 1800 a new menace threatened Britain from the north. Napoleon had contrived to return to France, had established his position as First Consul, crushed the Austrians at Marengo, and induced the Tsar of Russia, the Grand Master of the Knights of St. John, to demand the evacuation of Malta by the British. When this request was refused, Napoleon advised the Tsar to revive the Armed Neutrality, which had been enforced during the American war. This would deprive Britain of her Baltic trade, and as from this region she drew a large amount of material for shipbuilding, the matter was a serious one. Sweden and Denmark were prepared to join for grievances of their own. The British Government therefore sent Sir Hyde Parker as commander-in-chief to the Baltic, with Nelson as second-in-command. Parker was anxious to avoid any conflict, and trusted that the enemy would prove tractable. Russia, Sweden, and Denmark had some forty battleships between them, a force which outnumbered his own fleet by two to one. It was discovered that the Danes were quite intractable, and were fortifying Copenhagen. Nelson wished to push on to the Gulf of Finland and attack the Russians, but Parker, who had with difficulty been persuaded to countenance drastic measures of any kind, insisted that Copenhagen could not be left in their rear untaken, and Nelson therefore agreed to attack the Danish fleet. The only possible waterways into the Baltic were the Sound and the Great Belt. The former was the regular channel; the latter was perilous with shoals and uncharted banks. Parker wished to enter the Baltic by the Sound, and take his chance of passing the Swedish fortress of Helsingborg and the Danish Elsinore without damage. Nelson persuaded him to attempt the passage of the Great Belt, and thus to come upon Copenhagen from the south. The argument which weighed most heavily with Parker was the fact that the wind which enabled them to attack from the south would also carry them back again to the North Sea when the battle was over. However, once embarked upon this difficult piece of navigation, Parker lost his head and insisted upon returning. Nelson urged him to get into the Baltic somehow, and the fleet therefore sailed through the Sound, and escaped any damage from the guns of the fortress. The Danish ships were moored before Copenhagen in line-ahead formation, very much as the French ships had been at the battle of the Nile, but with the additional advantage that their lines could by no possible means be turned. There was nearly a mile of them, all told; many had their masts sawn off, and were used simply as floating gun platforms. The head of their line nearest the harbour was supported by the Tre Kroner batteries, planted upon artificial islands at the entrance. The harbour was not deep enough to accommodate the largest warships, which were there-



Horatio Nelson

HORATIO, LORD NELSON

From the painting by L. F. Abbott in the National Portrait Gallery, London

fore drawn up as Nelson found them. Immediately opposite Copenhagen lay an island, and the intervening channel, some two miles and a half across, was divided by a great shoal known as the Middle Ground. The passage farthest from the town was known as the Outer Deep and that nearest as the King's Deep, the eighteen ships that Nelson wished to attack being moored on the edge of the King's Deep. If Nelson was to proceed by the ordinary passage he would have to face the Tre Kroner fort; the Outer Deep would enable him to begin his battle at the very end of the Danish line, and this course he determined to take. The Danes had removed all the buoys, and he therefore had to construct for himself a chart of the passage. Soundings were taken at night, and by 1 April Nelson was ready. Parker had given him twelve ships, and all the frigates and sloops, and himself awaited the result with the remainder of the fleet. On 2 April Nelson arranged that the ships should go into action, that the leader should drop anchor opposite the fifth ship of the Danish line. Each ship as it followed the leader would discharge its broadside at the Danish vessels as it passed, pass the leader on her disengaged side, and take up the assigned position ahead. Three ships ran aground, and Nelson's force was thus dangerously weakened. The Danes fought with the utmost determination: boatloads of volunteers put off from the town to replace the heaps of killed and wounded. Meanwhile Parker was trembling for the consequences; he had done his best to send some reinforcements to Nelson, but wind and tide were against them. He had maintained that the attempt was impossible, and about one o'clock in the day he hoisted the signal of recall. This was the famous occasion when Nelson put the telescope to his blind eye, as recorded in Mr. Newbolt's poem.

Splinters were flying above, below,
When Nelson sailed the Sound:
"Mark you, I wouldn't be elsewhere now,"
Said he, "for a thousand pound!"
The Admiral's signal bade him fly,
But he wickedly wagged his head;
He clapped the glass to his sightless eye,
And, "I'm damned if I see it," he said.

About two o'clock the Danish fire slackened, several ships ceased firing, but when Nelson sent out his prize crews the Danes opened fire upon the boats, apparently from ignorance of the ordinary usages of naval war. Nelson therefore wrote a letter and sent in a flag of truce, which is evidence, not only of his determination, but also of his diplomacy:

To the Brothers of Englishmen, the Brave Danes.

Vice-Admiral Lord Nelson has been commanded to spare Denmark when she no longer resists. The line of defence which covered her shores has struck to the British flag. Let the firing cease, then, that he may take

possession of his prizes, or he will blow them into the air along with their crews who have so nobly defended them. The brave Danes are the brothers and should never be the enemies of the English.

Parker refused to proceed farther into the Baltic until Denmark had declared her neutrality, and Nelson succeeded in obtaining an armistice of neutrality for fourteen days. Sweden, however, declined to fight, and at that moment the Tsar was murdered. The northern confederacy therefore came to an end. Nelson himself regarded Copenhagen as his masterpiece. It was a victory almost as important as the battle of the Nile, and largely conduced to the conclusion of the Peace of Amiens in 1802, which ended the war of the French Revolution. Nelson then purchased an estate at Merton, between London and Portsmouth, and spent almost the happiest year of his life upon his own property.

In 1803 war broke out again, and the campaign which ended in Trafalgar began. Nelson was given command of the Mediterranean fleet, and began to blockade Toulon after hoisting his flag in the *Victory*. His fleet was inferior to the enemy's force, and the Gulf of Lyons, where he was obliged to keep watch, was constantly swept by storms. He suffered continually from seasickness, but his devices to keep his crews occupied, and the care with which he fed them, and foraged the Mediterranean shores for fresh provisions, animated the whole fleet with a spirit of light-hearted loyalty. As the fleet seldom numbered more than eight ships, he was obliged to raise the blockade at intervals when supplies of fresh water were needed, or when it was imperatively necessary to enter a harbour. At the beginning of 1805, when Nelson was in Sardinia, his frigates informed him that the French had left Toulon. The heavy weather made the passage of the Straits impossible, and Nelson went a round of the Mediterranean, concluding that Napoleon had some further devices in the East. By the end of March he found the French back in Toulon, and could not imagine why they had ever left the harbour. They had made an attempt to play their part in Napoleon's great combination for the conquest of Britain. The emperor was prepared, upon his own estimate, to embark 150,000 men in two hours. Whether this was a possible feat or not, it was at least certain that he must have complete command of the Channel during the space of time that the crossing would require, and that therefore the British fleet must be removed. Napoleon had fleets at Toulon, Cadiz, Coruña, and Brest, some fifty or sixty strong when united. He resolved that these should elude the British blockade, put forth into the Atlantic, unite at Martinique, and return in concentration to hold the Channel. By the end of March, 1805, Villeneuve and his fleet had succeeded in leaving Toulon. He had joined the Spanish squadron at Cadiz, and reached Martinique on 13 May with eighteen first-class battleships. The fleet at Brest, however, had been unable to move, owing to protracted calms and a stringent blockade. The emperor sent a message

to Villeneuve ordering him to leave the West Indies, unite the fleet at Ferrol, and sail for Brest, raise the blockade, and join the squadron there waiting, after which he would appear in the Channel in irresistible force. Villeneuve left Martinique early in June, but the bad sailing qualities of his fleet, especially of the Spanish contingent, delayed his progress, and he did not approach European quarters until July. Napoleon's strategy was constantly successful on land, but his ignorance of the conditions under which naval warfare is waged was never more apparent. When, for instance, he ordered his combined admirals to drive the British blockading force from Brest, and relieve the fleet there waiting, he was asking the impossible. Any wind which would have enabled the French to attack Cornwallis and his blockading force would have prevented the fleet in port from sailing out when the blockade had been raised.

Meanwhile Britain was in a great state of excitement. Every citizen shouldered a musket, beacons were erected on every hill, martello towers were built, and preparations made for coast defences. Probably the only people in the country who felt any security against an invasion were the naval authorities. Nelson, Cornwallis, and Jervis knew that Napoleon could not stir without his fleet, and were equally certain that his fleet would never reach Boulogne. Whether Napoleon seriously believed in the feasibility of his project is also a doubtful question. In any case it gave him an excuse for mobilizing an army at Boulogne, which he could employ against Austria at any moment. Meanwhile Nelson had been led by false reports to sail to Trinidad, and found that Villeneuve had gone. He at once recrossed the Atlantic in hot haste, and sent a brig to inform the admiralty that Villeneuve was on his way to Europe. This vessel overtook Villeneuve, counted his numbers, noted his position, and resumed her voyage. The first lord of the admiralty, after considering the circumstances, rightly came to the conclusion that Villeneuve was making for Ferrol, and ordered the fleets blockading Rochefort to join Sir Robert Calder, who was watching Ferrol. The combined force was then to put to sea on the Ferrol latitude, to intercept Villeneuve. The forces met on 22 July off Cape Finisterre. Calder fought an indecisive battle, and captured two ships, but he was unable to stop Villeneuve, who reached Ferrol, where he found a large French and Spanish squadron.

Two days previously Nelson had reached Gibraltar, and, leaving the greater part of his fleet at Brest, had gone to England. Calder had joined Cornwallis, and Villeneuve felt that if he attacked the force blockading Brest he would certainly be beaten before the French in the harbour could give him any assistance. On 11 August Villeneuve left Ferrol, and sent a message to Napoleon saying that he was on his way to Brest. However, he suffered badly in a gale, and heard that the British fleet was at hand. He therefore made sail for Cadiz, and thus ended the project of sweeping the Channel with a joint armada. Early in August Napoleon had completed his

preparations at Boulogne, and watched anxiously throughout that month for the sails of the combined fleet. When he heard that Villeneuve had given up the attempt he also abandoned his project, and marched his great army through France to the borders of Germany to oppose the Russian and Austrian forces which were threatening invasion. Thus ended a series of operations which showed the incompetency of the French to claim the mastery of the seas, and had there been any doubt upon this point it was removed shortly afterwards by the stroke delivered at Trafalgar.

As soon as it was known that Villeneuve was at Cadiz, Nelson immediately left England for his Spanish fleet, which he reached on 29 September, his forty-seventh birthday. He began to devise plans for inducing Villeneuve to leave Cadiz, but this difficulty was solved by Napoleon himself, who wanted a fleet in the Mediterranean, and ordered Villeneuve to land a detachment in the south of Italy. A hint from Napoleon that he might be superseded if he did not fight determined the French admiral to take all risks, and on 20 October, 1805, he was on the open sea. Nelson had weakened his fleet by sending a contingent to water and refit, and on the day of battle he had twenty-seven ships to the thirty-three of the allied fleet. On Monday, 21 October, the enemy were seen sailing along the Andalusian shore some 10 or 12 miles distant. Nelson did not propose to observe the traditional method of fighting in parallel formation; he determined to attack the enemy's rear. He therefore divided his fleet into two independent squadrons. The stronger was to attack the rearmost twelve of the enemy, while the second, which he led himself, was to deal with the remainder of the fleet, and hold them back until the first squadron had fulfilled its object. This mode of attack was known, and it was recognized that the only counter move was for the whole threatened fleet to wear ship, that is, for the rear to become the van, while the centre and former van moved up to its support. This Villeneuve did; his fleet had been sailing south, he turned on the opposite tack so that he would bring Cadiz under his lee in case he were forced or were able to run for shelter, while the shoals of Trafalgar would prove a danger to his adversary. Nelson hoisted his famous signal, and shortly after midday his vessels were within range. Collingwood pierced Villeneuve's centre, and nearly destroyed the *Santa Anna* with a single broadside. Nelson broke the line with the *Victory*, and the allied centre was soon reduced to a mere collection of shattered wrecks, while Collingwood's column almost destroyed the rear. Only eleven ships out of the thirty-three escaped, and many of these were soon afterwards captured by a British squadron. France as a great power was blotted from the seas.

But the victory was dearly bought by the death of Nelson. A musket shot from the tops of the *Redoutable* gave him his death wound. The closing scene has often been described, but never more minutely or more pathetically than by Southey:

THE DEATH OF NELSON. From the painting
by A. W. Devis in Greenwich Hospital.

The death of Nelson in the hour of victory at Trafalgar on 21st October, 1805, is one of the best-known incidents in naval history. After his flagship the *Victory* had severely punished the *Bucentaure*, the flagship of Villeneuve, the commander of the Franco-Spanish fleet, it became closely engaged with the *Redoubtable*. Nelson was fatally wounded by a musket-shot from the *Redoubtable* while he was walking the quarter-deck with Captain Hardy, and he died three hours afterwards in great pain, but not before he knew of the completeness of his victory. After commanding Lady Hamilton and his daughter Horatia to his country, he died with the words, "Thank God, I have done my duty".

Arthur William Devis (1763-1822) was known chiefly as a portrait and history painter. This picture was painted soon after the battle, and was presented by Lord Bexley to Greenwich Hospital in 1825. It is of great size, 8 feet 7 inches by 6 feet 4 inches.

A. W. DEVIS

Reproduced by permission of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty

THE DEATH OF NELSON



The cockpit was crowded with wounded and dying men, over whose bodies he was, with some difficulty, conveyed, and laid upon a pallet in the midshipmen's berth. It was soon perceived, upon examination, that the wound was mortal. This, however, was concealed from all except Captain Hardy, the chaplain, and the medical attendants. He himself being certain, from the sensation in his back and the gush of blood he felt momently within his breast, that no human care could avail him, insisted that the surgeon should leave him and attend to those to whom he might be useful; "for," said he, "you can do nothing for me." All that could be done was to fan him with paper, and frequently to give him lemonade to alleviate his intense thirst. He was in great pain, and expressed much anxiety for the event of the action, which now began to declare itself. As often as a ship struck, the crew of the *Victory* hurrahed, and at every hurrah a visible expression of joy gleamed in the eyes and marked the countenance of the dying hero. But he became impatient to see Captain Hardy; and as that officer, though often sent for, could not leave the deck, Nelson feared that some fatal cause prevented him, and repeatedly cried: "Will no one bring Hardy to me? He must be killed! He is surely dead!" An hour and ten minutes elapsed from the time when Nelson received his wound before Hardy could come to him. They shook hands in silence, Hardy in vain struggling to repress the feelings of that most painful and yet sublimest moment. "Well, Hardy," said Nelson, "how goes the day with us?" "Very well," replied Hardy. "Ten ships have struck, but five of them have tacked and show every intention to bear down upon the *Victory*. I have called two or three of our fresh ships round, and have no doubt of giving them a drubbing!" "I hope," said Nelson, "none of our ships have struck?" Hardy answered: "There was no fear of that." Then, and not till then, Nelson spoke of himself. "I am a dead man, Hardy," said he. "I am going fast: it will be all over with me soon. Come nearer to me. Let my dear Lady Hamilton have my hair, and all other things belonging to me." Hardy observed that he hoped Mr. Beatty could yet hold out some prospect of life. "Oh, no," he replied, "it is impossible! My back is shot through. Beatty will tell you so." Captain Hardy then once more shook hands with him, and, with a heart almost bursting, hastened upon deck.

By this time all feeling below the breast was gone; and Nelson, having made the surgeon ascertain this, said to him: "You know I am gone, I know it, I feel something rising in my breast"—putting his hand on his left side—"which tells me so." And upon Beatty's enquiring whether his pain was very great, he replied: "So great that he wished he was dead. Yet," said he in a lower voice, "one would like to live a little longer too!" And a few minutes after, in the same tone, he added: "What would become of poor Lady Hamilton if she knew my situation!" Next to his country she occupied his thoughts. Captain Hardy, some fifty minutes after he had left the cockpit, returned; and again taking the hand of his dying friend and commander, congratulated him upon having gained a complete victory. How many of the enemy were taken he did not know, as it was impossible to perceive them distinctly, but fourteen or fifteen at least. "That's well," cried Nelson, "but I bargained for twenty." And then, in a stronger voice, he said: "Anchor, Hardy, anchor." Hardy, upon this, hinted that Admiral Collingwood would take upon himself the direction of affairs. "Not while I live, Hardy," said the dying Nelson, ineffectually endeavouring to raise himself from the bed. "Do you anchor." His previous order to prepare to anchor had shown how clearly

he foresaw the necessity for this. Presently, calling Hardy back, he said to him in a low voice: "Don't throw me overboard," and he desired that he might be buried by his parents, unless it should please the King to order otherwise. Then reverting to private feelings: "Take care of Lady Hamilton, Hardy, take care of poor Lady Hamilton. Kiss me, Hardy," said he. Hardy knelt down and kissed his cheek; and Nelson said: "Now I am satisfied. Thank God I have done my duty." Hardy stood over him in silence for a moment or two, then knelt again and kissed his forehead. "Who is that?" said Nelson; and, on being informed, he replied: "God bless you, Hardy." And Hardy then left him for ever.

Nelson now desired to be turned upon his right side, and said: "I wish I had not left the deck, for I shall soon be gone." Death was, indeed, fast approaching. He said to the chaplain: "Doctor, I have *not* been a great sinner," and after a short pause, "Remember that I leave Lady Hamilton and my daughter Horatia as a legacy to my country." His articulation was now becoming difficult, but he was distinctly heard to say: "Thank God, I have done my duty." These words he repeatedly pronounced, and they were the last words which he uttered. He expired at thirty minutes after four—three hours and a quarter after he had received his wound.

Nelson's body was carried home in a temporary coffin, and lay in state at Greenwich from the fourth to the eighth of January. On the ninth took place the impressive funeral scene in St. Paul's Cathedral, and forty-six years later the fellow genius who had done as much to crush Napoleon by land as Nelson had achieved by sea joined his rest beneath the dome of the cathedral. Wellington and Nelson fought upon opposite elements, but they were kindred spirits in their genius and devotion to duty.

CHAPTER VIII

Wellington (A.D. 1769-1852)

Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington, was born in Ireland in 1769. His father was Lord Mornington, and the family name of Wesley he afterwards changed to the more ancient spelling, Wellesley. Like Clive, he was regarded as the dunce of the family, and his brief career at Eton was in no way distinguished. He spent some time at a French military school, where he at least learnt to ride, and acquired a knowledge of the French language which he afterwards found extremely useful. Upon his father's death in 1781 his elder brother, Richard, who succeeded to the earldom, watched his career and secured a military commission for him. Political and social influence and the power of purchase raised him to a lieutenant-colonelcy in 1793, when he was twenty-four years of age. He also entered the Irish House of Commons. He distinguished himself as soon as he attained the command of his regiment, the 33rd Foot, by the energy and perseverance with which he maintained the efficiency of his regiment. He first saw service in 1794, with the reinforcements sent to the duke of York, who was operating against the French in the Netherlands. When Wellesley and his command arrived at Antwerp the duke was in full retreat, and Colonel Wellesley was placed in command of the rearguard, where his coolness and promptitude speedily attracted attention. Operations were carried on in a winter of unusual severity, and the troops suffered great privations. The future commander-in-chief observed that war was conducted upon principles far too haphazard to satisfy his exacting mind. Dispatches were thrown aside if they happened to interfere with social engagements, and in after-years he was accustomed to express his surprise that any of the force escaped. In 1795 he brought his regiment home again, impressed with the fact that war was a serious business demanding earnest preparations and careful forethought, qualities which seemed to him conspicuous by their absence in the service. He actually applied for a post in the civil department, the revenue or treasury board, and probably might have become a distinguished financier, for which branch of government he afterwards showed the highest aptitude in India. Fortunately for his country the application was refused. He remained in the army, and in 1796 the 33rd Foot and its commander were ordered to Calcutta, which was reached in the beginning of the following year.

European History

Wellesley, then twenty-eight years of age, arrived in India at a critical moment. His elder brother, Lord Mornington, was governor-general at the same time, and this fact gave Arthur the opportunity of showing his capacities as a soldier and an administrator. The chief power in India at that time was held by the Mahrattas, while the Carnatic was constantly menaced by the sultan of Mysore, Tippoo, who had been previously defeated by Lord Cornwallis. These Indian chieftains were often assisted by European adventurers. A certain de Boigne, for instance, had disciplined a large body of infantry in Scindia's dominions. The British dominions were a mere fringe upon the seacoast; the sphere of influence extended from Bengal up the valley of the Ganges into central India. The Madras possessions extended but a short way beyond the seaboard, while Bombay was little more than an island. The company was perfectly willing to remain neutral and to confine themselves to trade. On the other hand, the native princes were equally desirous of driving out the intruders, but their continual rivalry and mutual jealousies made it impossible for them to combine for this object. Previous governors, such as Cornwallis and Shore, had found that a pacific policy was impossible, and when Lord Mornington arrived in India danger was threatening from Mysore. Echoes of the French success in Europe had penetrated even to the remote regions of India. Tippoo had concluded an alliance with the French governor of the Mauritius, while Bonaparte had invaded Egypt with the object of attacking India by the Red Sea route. Lord Mornington therefore resolved to anticipate the danger and to attack Tippoo's capital, Seringapatam; but he was unable to act until six months had elapsed, the smallest time in which due preparations could be made. The greater part of this work fell upon Arthur Wellesley, and he then displayed that signal care for the health of his troops and the watchful supervision of small details by which his experience had shown him that the foundations of success could alone be laid. He had to contend with dishonest and incapable agents, and not only to provide his troops with transport, provisions, and equipment, but also to watch over their training; all of which he accomplished with such success that when General Harris, his superior officer, came to take up his command in January, 1799, he found a well-organized and capable division at his disposal. Tippoo was beaten in two engagements in the open field and driven into his capital, which was stormed in the month of April, when the sultan was killed in the assault. Wellesley was left in command of the town, and for the next three months was fully occupied with the complicated business of restoring order, distributing prize money, and settling the future government of the district. Additional labours were caused by the number of robber chieftains who infested the roads and endangered communications, and one at least of these could only be crushed when a regular campaign had been undertaken against him. For nearly two years he was stationed in Seringapatam, ruling the province of Mysore, watching the movements of the native politics,



ARTHUR WELLESLEY, DUKE OF WELLINGTON

From the painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A., in the Hall of Wellington College

Wellington

training his troops, and awaiting news of the great struggle in Europe, the reverberations of which were readily perceptible in India. In 1803 a new disturbance arose which obliged him once more to take the field.

The overthrow of Tippoo left the company confronted by the sole remaining power in India, the Mahratta confederacy. Had the various chieftains been able or willing to act in concert they would have formed the most formidable counterpoise to the British power in India, but their continual rivalries and disputes kept them in a state of internecine war, and one such dynastic quarrel brought the English into the field again. The chieftain Scindia, who was supreme at Poona, interfered in a succession quarrel, and one of the claimants applied to the British for help, agreeing to place himself entirely in their hands by a treaty which Wellesley, at least, hoped would secure peace in southern India once and for all. When the British, under Wellesley, moved forward to place the claimant on the throne, Scindia adopted a neutral policy; but as soon as the British were sufficiently far from their base he seemed inclined to attack. Wellesley declined to enter upon the course of haggling and intrigue which the Indian chief seemed to think was inevitable, and proceeded to capture his fortresses and to establish himself in the country. The result was a series of engagements which ended in the battle of Assaye, in which the Mahrattas were totally defeated, and the war in the Deccan was definitely decided in favour of the English. At the beginning of 1805, when the danger had been averted, Wellesley determined to return to England. He was broken in health, homesick, and probably extremely anxious to meet the lady to whom he had been engaged, and from whom he had now been separated for nearly ten years. Their marriage took place shortly after his return in 1805, at the moment when Napoleon was making preparations for the campaign which was originally intended for the invasion of Britain, and which culminated in the battle of Austerlitz.

Wellesley entered Parliament, and made a great impression by his speeches on Indian policy. He was also retained upon active service, and was for some time stationed in command of a brigade at Hastings, to watch the French on the opposite coast. In 1807 Sir Arthur Wellesley, as he then was, became chief secretary to the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, a troublesome post which he held for two years, and which was twice interrupted by service in Denmark and Portugal. After the Peace of Tilsit, Napoleon and Alexander agreed that the latter should appropriate the Danish and Portuguese fleets, the more efficiently to carry on his commercial war with Great Britain. Both of these were neutral states, and Portugal was friendly with Britain. The British ministers received timely information of this secret understanding, and resolved to forestall Napoleon by seizing the Danish fleet. A British squadron descended upon Copenhagen and informed the astonished Danes that their fleet and stores must be surrendered, but would be held merely as a deposit, to be returned at the end of the war. The Danish refusal was followed by a fearfully destructive bombardment of

European History

the town, in the course of which Wellesley was operating with the land force and driving the Danes out of Zealand. By 20 October the forces were back again in England with fifteen battleships, several frigates, and 20,000 tons of valuable stores, a proceeding which certainly inflicted a severe check upon Napoleon's plans, but drove the Danes into his arms, and aroused deep indignation upon the Continent. Napoleon then began his operations in Spain and Portugal. Portugal was ordered to close her ports to Britain and to confiscate all British property, and when the regent declined to agree to this decision the French army, under Junot, was ordered to march upon Lisbon in October, 1807. The king and the royal family fled to Brazil, escorted by the fleet, which thus evaded Napoleon's grasp. At the same time the French columns overran Spain, seized Madrid, and forced the Bourbon king, Charles IV, to resign his crown, which was bestowed upon Napoleon's brother Joseph. The Spaniards, in fury, revolted in every quarter of the country, and in their first onslaught drove the French beyond the Ebro. Britain readily and lavishly supported the Spaniards, and then began the long conflict in the Peninsula and Portugal with the forces of Napoleon. The first detachment of reinforcements was commanded by Sir Arthur Wellesley. The battle of Vimeiro, in 1807, was a severe defeat for the French, and was gained under Wellesley's command. He was then superseded, and the convention of Cintra was signed, arranging for the evacuation of Portugal by the French army. This was a severe check to Napoleon's plans; but Wellesley was convinced that he could have captured the whole of the army had he been left undisturbed in his command. Such was the public opinion, and the conclusion of the convention caused an outburst of wrath in Britain, much of which was turned upon Wellesley, though he was in no way responsible for the signing of the convention. He was called to appear before a court of enquiry, and was thus unable to join Sir John Moore in his unfortunate expedition, which ended for him at Coruña.

After this disaster King Joseph re-entered Madrid, and Napoleon considered that Spain had been finally conquered. He therefore turned his attention to Austria. But the British ministers had no intention of abandoning the struggle, and in the spring of 1809 Sir Arthur Wellesley landed at Lisbon, took command of the British forces, and began a series of operations which formed the first step in the overthrow of Napoleon. The Portuguese received him with great enthusiasm, appointed him marshal-general, and gave him 9000 troops, which raised the total numbers of his force to some 25,000. The enemies before him were Soult at Oporto and Victor at the head of the Tagus valley. Wellesley resolved to strike at Soult, and prevent any junction between the two armies, and to avoid any immediate necessity for co-operating with the Spaniards, whose leader, Cuesta, was a quarrelsome and unreliable character, and who, excellent soldiers as they were for guerrilla warfare, could not be trusted to sustain the shock of a pitched battle. Soult was surprised by Wellington's advance

Wellington

and by the dexterity with which he crossed the Douro, the French chief line of defence. He contrived to withdraw his troops from Portugal, though forced to leave his guns and most of his baggage behind him. Wellesley then turned upon Victor. The result of this campaign was the battle of Talavera, a long and heroic struggle which some historians claim as a French victory. Napoleon himself was under no such illusion. But the advance of Soult, the helplessness of the Spaniards, and the incapacity of Cuesta obliged Wellesley to fall back. Realizing that he could not trust to Spanish help, he resolved to defend the Peninsula and Portugal with his British troops and the Portuguese army.

Napoleon had some foreboding of the prophecy that Spain was destined to be the grave of the French. In 1809 he ordered 100,000 men to be collected and concentrated between Bayonne and Orléans, and notified his intention of leading these reinforcements into Spain in person. In 1810 Napoleon, busy with the question of his divorce, and occupied by friction with Russia, was unable to appear in the Peninsula in person, but he urged his marshals to make a supreme effort, poured troops into the country, and gave Masséna chief command of the army which was to conquer Portugal. The Spanish guerrilla forces constantly inflicted damage upon the enemy, but were as constantly beaten whenever they attempted to make a stand. Sir Arthur, now Viscount Wellington, was obliged not only to confront the formidable army brought against him, but to deal with despair among the Portuguese officials and with hesitancy in his own Government. In the spring of 1810 Masséna, with a force of 80,000 men, captured Ciudad Rodrigo as a base for his attack on Portugal. Wellington was strongly urged to relieve the town, but its capture would have in no way improved his position or helped towards the plan which he had formed. The greatness of his character was largely due to that statesmanship which enabled him to recognize existing facts, to form a plan and policy for dealing with them, and to adhere with unshaken tenacity to the projects upon which he had once determined. Wellington therefore slowly retreated, devastating the country as he went, and inflicting a lesson upon the enemy by the battle of Busaco, in which the French lost some 4500 killed and wounded. But the retreat continued, and Masséna felt, no doubt, that the British intended to embark at Lisbon; and leave him master of the country. Great was his astonishment to find that the heights flanked by the Tagus and the Atlantic had been converted into a fortress, and that his advance was checked by the so-called lines of Torres Vedras. These formidable works were a surprise, not only to the French, but also to the Portuguese in the British army. Wellington had successfully concealed his intentions, and for the first time the enemy began to realize his extraordinary genius for war. Attempts made by the French to turn the lines or to pierce them were a complete failure, and Wellington was able to maintain his ground even against disaffection in the Portuguese regency and despondency in his own country. At

European History

length he obtained the reinforcements that he required, and Masséna, after a long stay in the valley of the Tagus, when his army had been greatly reduced by disease, resolved to retreat. The movement was cleverly managed, and he obtained a long start before Wellington was able to begin the pursuit. In the course of a month he was driven back to Salamanca, after losing every battle and 30,000 men in the campaign. Lord Liverpool was able to refer to the progress of the British armies in terms of the highest congratulation, and the Government expressed every confidence in Wellington's capacities.

Marmont had now taken Masséna's command, and was operating in conjunction with Soult; but the two generals found it difficult to join hands, as Soult was responsible for the safety of the southern provinces, while Marmont did not feel strong enough to stand alone. Then King Joseph suddenly expressed a desire to abdicate, and Napoleon had some difficulty in pacifying him. He was also occupied by preparations for the approaching war with Russia. By clever manœuvring, Wellington drove the French to the frontiers of Castile, and a period of inaction followed which was broken by the siege of Ciudad Rodrigo, a fortress indispensable to Wellington's advance, and the value of which compensated for the heavy loss which attended its capture. Then came the siege of Badajos, which cost Wellington more than 5000 killed and wounded. Portugal was safe, and it was now possible for him to take the offensive in Spain.

Wellington, having thus secured his hold on Portugal by the capture of the two frontier fortresses, was now able to cut the communications of the enemy between Seville and Madrid; improvements in the navigation of the Douro and the Tagus facilitated the transport of supplies, while Marmont and Soult were unwilling to act in harmony, partly in consequence of mutual prejudice and partly because each was expecting an attack upon his own position. Wellington, therefore, moved southward towards Salamanca. The forts were taken and Marmont was forced to retreat beyond the Douro. In the course of the succeeding battle of Salamanca, Marmont was wounded and his army was driven back upon Burgos. Wellington was able to enter Madrid on 12 August, and received an enthusiastic welcome from the inhabitants, who regarded him as their deliverer. Meanwhile, Soult had abandoned the siege of Cadiz and was retiring through Andalusia. Wellington's object, therefore, was to detain him beyond the Tagus, while he secured his line to the north of Madrid. For this purpose it was necessary to capture Burgos; but the town was strong, Wellington's siege train was inadequate, and the Portuguese allies incapable. After a month of desperate struggle he was forced to move south, as Soult's army was advancing to Madrid in conjunction with the forces of Joseph. Wellington's lieutenant, Hill, upon the Tagus, held a command numerically greatly inferior to the enemy; if Wellington desired to preserve his line of retreat to Portugal, instant action was necessary. Moreover, the French general, Souham, was moving forward with a new army upon his southern front. Wellington was

Wellington

therefore obliged to recross the Douro, a difficult operation with an enemy harassing his army, but one which was carried out with complete success. Hill then retired from the Tagus, and joined Wellington on 8 November, near the battlefield of Salamanca. They had 68,000 men between them, while the French were advancing from Castile and Leon 100,000 strong. Wellington held his ground, prepared to fight if necessary; but Soult attempted a turning operation, in the hope of cutting the allies off from Ciudad Rodrigo. Wellington countered this move by marching around the French army, an astonishing feat of audacity which he was enabled to accomplish by the celerity of his movements, by better roads, and by the thick fog. The campaign was now ended, and the army went into winter quarters. The prospects for the following year, 1813, were very hopeful. Napoleon was in full and disastrous retreat from Moscow, and it was obvious that he would have no forces to spare for Spain. The Spanish Government had made Wellington commander-in-chief of their armies, and his victories had gained him the confidence of the British Government. He was thanked by both houses of Parliament, raised to the rank of Marquis, and given a grant of £10,000. Moreover, during the winter he received further reinforcements of cavalry. Soult had been recalled by Napoleon, and the French generals in command were not equal to the superhuman tasks which the emperor imposed upon them.

In the spring of the following year Wellington moved forward to Salamanca, and cleverly transported his army across the Douro; he commanded 90,000 troops with 100 guns. The French immediately abandoned Madrid, and moved along the highroad to France, abandoning Burgos and retreating upon the Ebro. Wellington moved his left-hand line far north, made Santander his new basis of operations, and succeeded in turning his enemy's right. By 19 June, the French main body was gathered at Vittoria. A day's fighting drove them back upon Pampeluna, the main road was blocked by their baggage and transport, they lost 150 of their guns, all their baggage, and a million sterling of treasure. In a few days the only Frenchmen left in Spain were the detachments under Suchet, who was busy with the insurrection of the Anglo-Sicilian army in Valencia and Catalonia. Wellington proceeded to besiege San Sebastian and Pampeluna, and it was obvious that with these further bases of operations he could invade the south of France. Meanwhile Napoleon, on receipt of this disastrous news, ordered Soult to return to the command of the Spanish armies. A long and desperate struggle took place among the mountains and valleys of the northern frontier. Soult attempted to break the line of the allies by massing divisions against what seemed to him the weakest spots; but Wellington, with masterly activity, was able to strengthen the threatened points in time, and by 3 August the French were again within their own frontier. Wellington has been censured for not immediately pursuing them; but he considered that, before entering France, San Sebastian must be reduced, while he

could not afford to forget that Suchet was still in Catalonia. The difficulty of his achievement was not merely due to the fact that for much of the time he was operating in broken and mountainous country against two separate armies; it must also be remembered that he had to keep an eye upon the whole field of military operations, which included Germany and the Rhine as well as Spain. The siege of San Sebastian cost him heavily in officers and men; he was not as well supported by the home Government as he might have been, and he could not afford to delay. Disgraceful atrocities were perpetrated by a few uncontrolled British soldiers during the sack of the town, which was partly reduced to ashes by a conflagration. Soult made a desperate attempt to relieve it, but failed, and therefore proceeded to entrench himself upon the line of hills between the Nivelle and Bidassoa. Wellington could not advance upon him immediately, as Pampeluna was still untaken, while Suchet might possibly support Soult's force; but when it seemed certain that this eventuality would not come to pass, and when news arrived from Saxony of Napoleon's defeat by the allies, Wellington resolved to move. Soult was deceived by a clever stratagem and his earthworks were attacked at their weakest point. By the middle of November he was driven out of these entrenchments and retired upon Bayonne, while Wellington ordered the whole of his Spanish troops except one division into Spain, as a punishment for their continual marauding and disobedience to orders.

Then followed a period of inactivity, during which Wellington was haranguing and persuading the British, Spanish, and Portuguese Governments to send him reinforcements, and particularly funds. The allies had now crossed the Rhine, and Napoleon began his famous campaign of 1814. Many of Soult's forces had been withdrawn for the emperor's use, but even so the French were numerically equal to the allies. Wellington succeeded in crossing the Adour below the town and contrived to invest Bayonne. Soult was forced to leave his fortified camp to preserve communications with Toulouse. Cut off from Bordeaux, he hung upon the spurs of the Pyrenees, and fell slowly back upon Toulouse. The weariness felt by the population, and their long sufferings under the wars of Napoleon, were shown by the readiness with which they brought provisions to the British camp. Wellington's care to see that they were scrupulously well treated and paid gained him the good feelings of the peasantry. Wellington then attacked Soult's defences before Toulouse, and, by threatening to cut off his only line of retreat through Carcassonne, drove him out of his entrenchments by 11 April.

Three days before that date Napoleon had abdicated. Soult declined to recognize the fall of his emperor until he received authentic information from Napoleon himself. The British army was then dispersed, and the general reached Paris in May, to find himself duke of Wellington. He was then obliged to go to Madrid and settle Ferdinand VII upon the throne which he misused, but in June he

THE PASSAGE OF THE BIDASSOA BY
LORD WELLINGTON, 7th OCTOBER, 1813.
From a painting by Richard Beavis, R.W.S., in the
Sunderland Art Gallery.

The incident here depicted marks an important stage in the Peninsular War. The Bidassoa is a small river flowing into the Bay of Biscay, and forming in its lower course the frontier between Spain and France. Wellington threw his left across this river and began the invasion of France on 7th October, 1813, after he had won the battles of Vittoria and the Pyrenees and carried San Sebastian by storm, but he did not advance farther into France until he had taken the fortress of Pamplona on 31st October.

The artist, Richard Beavis, was born in 1824 and died in 1896. He is chiefly known as a landscape painter.

R. BEAVIS, R.W.S.

THE MASSACRE OF THE BIDASSOA BY LORD WELLINGTON, OCT. 5, 1813



Wellington

was able to return to England after an absence of five years. They were five years in which he had inflicted as vital a wound upon Napoleon's power as all the forces of the allies succeeded in doing on the other side of Europe. Napoleon himself recognized the power and genius of his adversary in Spain from the outset, and for that reason detailed his greatest lieutenant, Masséna, to overwhelm him. Wellington's success was gained, not only by consummate generalship, but also by his infinite patience and his business capacity. When waiting was necessary, as at Torres Vedras, he could wait; when retreat was inevitable, as at Burgos, he could retreat. Napoleon's Russian campaign provided the final opportunity, and in the next year Wellington was able to drive the French entirely out of the Peninsula with the exception of the forces in Catalonia. It now seemed that the sanguinary struggle had come to an end: even Wellington's insight could not then foresee the Hundred Days.

Wellington returned to England amid universal applause. He received the personal thanks of the House of Commons and a grant of £400,000, while the city gave him a banquet in the Guildhall. But he was not able to enjoy his well-earned leisure for long. He was sent as ambassador to Paris, where, as may well be imagined, his presence was not entirely popular. In fact, the choice was a mistake, hostility was shown him by the Bonapartists, and the ministry devised excuses for bringing him home. But Wellington refused to go; he repeatedly hinted that some event might occur which would make his presence necessary. In the spring of 1815 he left Paris to take Lord Castlereagh's place at the Congress of Vienna. The congress was busy fighting for the spoils, and a secret alliance was actually formed between Austria, France, and England to resist the demands of the northern powers. It seemed that a struggle could only be averted by further compromises, when Napoleon himself solved the difficulty for the moment. In the Island of Elba he had kept a careful eye upon the course of events. Murat, in Naples, was ready to help him; the disbanded remnants of his armies were dissatisfied with the new state of affairs, and Wellington seems to have seen as clearly as Napoleon that the emperor's return was by no means an impossible or fantastic undertaking. Early in March the Congress of Vienna was thunderstruck to learn that the emperor was in France, moving towards the capital, and in full possession of the resources of the country. The sovereigns and ambassadors immediately set their armies in motion, the congress declared him an outlaw, and Wellington started for Brussels to take command of the army of the Netherlands. There he arrived on 4 April, and found the situation far from satisfactory. The British ministry could not provide the forces which he required, and by the end of May he had only 105,000 men of all nationalities, and many of these contingents were unreliable. The Prussians had also come into touch with him and formed a considerable force. Napoleon resolved to strike upon the northern frontier first, and collected some 130,000 men for the

invasion of Belgium. Many of his regiments were veteran troops and he was well supplied with artillery.

The allied forces in Belgium were posted in two divisions. Wellington's headquarters were at Brussels, whence he maintained communications with Ostend and Antwerp. Blücher was at Namur, drawing supplies from the Rhine district. Each general was prepared to assist the other by marching right or left as occasion might demand. Their centre was marked by the highroad to Brussels, which was cut at right angles by the road from Nivelles to Namur, over which communications between the two armies passed. Napoleon at once saw the weakness of this position, and resolved to employ the strategy in which at one time he was unsurpassed, and to strike between the two armies with the object of defeating them in succession. If he could secure possession of Quatrebras, and the village of Sombreffe on the same road nearer to Namur, before the allies made any attempt to check him, the success of his manœuvres seemed assured. It is easy for strategists to say, speaking after the events and with full knowledge of the conditions, what Wellington and Blücher ought to have done. They should, no doubt, have joined forces before Napoleon could strike at their centre. Blücher was ready to move, as his own line of communications with the Rhine were not endangered, but Wellington had to think of his communications with England, and to be certain that Napoleon did not intend to cut him off from Ostend and Antwerp. Hence Blücher was able to concentrate part of his forces at Sombreffe on 14 June, while Wellington, at Brussels, had no information of Napoleon's movements. On the fifteenth the French attacked Ziethen and the Prussian detachments before Fleurus, but Napoleon was unable to reach Sombreffe and the road to Namur as he had hoped. At the same time he was fully satisfied with the progress he had made, and not until three o'clock in the afternoon did Wellington hear any rumour of these movements. Some time before midnight Wellington received information upon which he could act, and ordered his troops to march by Nivelles towards the scene of the conflict. He then called upon the German general, Müffling, to say what he had done, that information might be sent to Blücher. The two men appeared together at the famous ball given by the duchess of Richmond, in order to allay possible excitement among the numerous Bonapartists in Brussels.

On the morning of the sixteenth Wellington rode out and reached Quatrebras about eleven o'clock. His reserves had already advanced as far as Waterloo, the French were skirmishing with his outposts in front of Quatrebras, and Wellington therefore rode along the Namur road until he reached the Prussian position, and there he had an interview with Blücher. Blücher had three corps at Ligny, in front of Sombreffe, and Napoleon ordered Ney to seize Quatrebras, and sent a detachment to hold the ground between Quatrebras and Sombreffe. In this way Ney would have held Blücher in check, or have attacked him on the flank, while Napoleon himself attacked the Prussian centre and left at the village of Sombreffe. Ney, however, did not

Safary	1000	
Wellington	1000	1
Our County'	was	9
Hants	was	9
Bathurst	1000	
Legion	3091.	8 one
Guaranty	16	
Revenue stamp	700	
Church Stephen	50	
		10500
Cavalry - June 1818/5-		
The above Compensation for the Duke of Wellington's Guard writing was given by His Grace to Sir John Scott, Dr Adjutant General previous to the Battle of Waterloo		2000

WELLINGTON'S NOTE OF THE CAVALRY UNDER HIS COMMAND AT WATERLOO

(British Museum)

arrive; he made slow progress and failed to carry out the emperor's orders. Wellington's troops were therefore able to reach Quatrebras in time, and Ney merely prevented Wellington and Blücher from joining hands, and did not materially assist the emperor's progress.

On the morning of the seventeenth Wellington was informed that Blücher had retreated upon Wavre. The Prussians had been defeated in the preceding day's battle, but by no means routed. Wellington therefore fell back himself upon Waterloo, where he told Blücher that he would stand fast, and asked for support. Blücher promised to come with the whole of his army; Wellington could trust his word, and therefore held his ground at Waterloo. The emperor resolved to attack Wellington, and sent Grouchy with a restraining force of 34,000 men to hold Blücher in check. Grouchy, however, was by no means certain in which direction Blücher had gone. Napoleon himself seems to have thought that the Prussians would retreat upon Liège, with a view to falling back upon the Rhine. On the night of the seventeenth, however, Grouchy was informed of the Prussian position, and his dispatch to Napoleon clearly shows that he understood his mission, which was to hold Blücher in check while Napoleon attacked Wellington. By the time the battle of Waterloo had begun, Blücher's army had rested at Wavre, and had been joined by 30,000 men under Bulow, all of whom were ardently burning to avenge their recent defeat at Ligny. Wellington seems to have hoped that these forces or part of them would have been in line by midday on 18 June, but Blücher had underrated the difficulty of the country which he had to traverse, while he could not be sure that he would be unmolested by the French upon his way. Thus on the night of the seventeenth Napoleon felt confident that he had separated the two commanders, and that he would be able to attack Wellington with overwhelming forces. On the other hand, Wellington hoped to do that which Napoleon had himself planned, to hold the French in check until Blücher could attack their right flank and rear.

The battle of Waterloo began about noon on the eighteenth, a Sunday. No detailed description need be given of what has been so often described. Early in the battle part of Bulow's corps was seen on the extreme French right, and Napoleon was obliged to dispatch 10,000 men to hold them in check, while he engaged Wellington's left. His first great effort failed. Bulow's Prussians began to drive their enemy back by weight of numbers, and Napoleon therefore abandoned the attack on Wellington's left and threw his whole weight upon the centre. A gap was opened in Wellington's defences which enabled the French cavalry to pass, but Blücher had by this time joined Bulow and made a vigorous attack upon Napoleon's right flank. The French guard was detailed to stop him, but Ney's horsemen failed to break the Prussian squares. At seven o'clock in the evening the emperor made a final effort upon the British centre, but the duke had strengthened his weak points and repulsed the attack of the guard. At that moment Ziethen's force appeared upon

European History

the field, Wellington ordered a general advance, and the French retreat became a dreadful rout.

Wellington's feelings after the battle have often been recorded. Detractors have accused him of indifference to human suffering and carelessness where life was concerned, but it was Waterloo that inspired him with the saying: "Nothing is worse than a victory except a defeat". The list of killed and wounded moved him to tears. The allied armies then marched upon Paris, and hostilities came to an end fifteen days after Waterloo. The emperor escaped the animosity of Blücher by surrendering to the British captain of the *Bellerophon*. The duke of Wellington remained in France for three years longer, in command of the army of occupation, but his career of active service was over.

In the autumn of 1818 he returned to England, and took a seat in Lord Liverpool's cabinet. He spent much time in improving his estate, and became a model landlord. Britain was entirely exhausted by the long strain of war, and a spirit of discontent was abroad among the nation which broke out at times in riots. Nor was Europe at large any more peaceful; if war had ceased between state and state, nearly every country had internal troubles of its own. The Spaniards, for instance, held their king almost a prisoner, and Wellington was sent to a conference at Verona to meet the representatives of the Holy Alliance formed by the emperor of Russia to decide what should be done. He was of opinion that there was no case for interference as far as Britain was concerned. On his return to England he was subjected to some criticism for his action in the matter. The French ultra-royalists wished to invade Spain, in the belief that such action would strengthen the restored Bourbon dynasty. A strong party in Britain wished to take the side of the Spaniards. Wellington simply moved cautiously, and left his Government free to act as it might think best. Then in 1825 he was sent to St. Petersburg upon the death of the Emperor Alexander, to meet the new emperor, Nicholas, and ascertain his intentions towards Greece and Turkey. At the congress of Verona he had been able to avert a war between Russia and Turkey, and he was now able to continue these good offices.

In 1826 Lord Liverpool retired from office, in consequence of ill health. The king sent for Canning to form a ministry, and this orator asked the duke to join him. The duke declined, and Canning was unable to maintain the principles of Lord Liverpool's ministry; nor was the earl of Ripon any more successful. In June, 1828, the king sent for the duke and made him prime minister. Canning's party joined him until the Huskisson incident, when all the members went out of office. Roman Catholic Emancipation and the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts occupied much of his attention, and brought upon him an enormous amount of trouble and anxiety. Then he had to thwart the policy of the Russian emperor as far as he could in face of the pro-Russian policy left to him as a legacy from the former ministry. The Reform Bill proposals of 1830 brought his burden of office to an end.

During the political crisis between 1834 and 1835, when Sir Robert Peel was in Italy, the duke carried on the government as prime minister, until his return. He was a member of Peel's cabinet in 1841 and 1846, and his last political service was the support which he gave his chief in abolishing the Corn Laws. In 1848 he startled the nation with the letter upon the defenceless state of the English southern coasts. He first set in motion the movement for the better organization of the home defences. Many anecdotes are told of his later years, when he was a well-known figure in society. His generosity was great and was constantly imposed upon. The number of impostors who applied to him for relief upon the ground that they had fought under him was almost incredible, and yet none ever met with a refusal. The duke's frame of mind is explained by his well-known reply when he was rebuked for this indiscriminate charity: "What could I do; one could not let the man starve". In 1852 he died, and was buried by the side of Nelson in St. Paul's Cathedral. Every nation in Europe except Austria was represented at the graveside, and those who then thought over the career of the great captain seem chiefly to have been struck by the simplicity of his character. Throughout his life he used his unusual abilities, whether in war or in politics, to serve his country to the utmost of his power. It was this sense of duty which gave him the perseverance by which he overcame difficulties and the tenacity which no difficulties could daunt. The Spanish campaigns will ever remain a memorial of that which a general can accomplish with a small army and the combination of an instinct for detail with an eye for great principles.

CHAPTER IX

Metternich (A.D. 1773-1859)

From 1800 to 1814 Europe was ruled by force of arms. From 1814 to 1848 it was under the domination of a diplomatist. The negotiations and intrigues which led to the overthrow of Napoleon were directed by Metternich, and after the collapse of the French empire he succeeded in occupying, though with far less ostentation and far greater secrecy, the supremacy which Napoleon had formerly wielded. Europe, exhausted by war, desired at least external tranquillity after Waterloo, and failed to discover for a considerable time that it had merely exchanged one kind of despotism for another. The contrast between the methods of Metternich and of Napoleon was extended to their after career. Napoleon's name and fame are world-wide, but the name of Metternich is little known except to students of modern European history.

The great Austrian diplomatist was born at Coblenz on 15 May, 1773. After an education conducted at home under tutors he went to the university of Strasburg in 1788. In 1790 his father called him to Frankfort, to assist in the ceremonies held at the coronation of the Emperor Leopold, after which he resumed his studies at the university of Mayence. This town had become the refuge of a considerable number of French *émigrés*, and from them Metternich imbibed that hatred of revolution which was to be the guiding motive of his career. In 1792 he was again called to Frankfort for the coronation of the Emperor Francis, who had succeeded his brother, Leopold; there Metternich extended his acquaintance with the court society of Europe. He then returned to the university of Brussels to continue his studies. These were constantly interrupted by the military operations proceeding in the Low Countries, in the course of which his father employed him to carry messages between Brussels and the Austrian army. In the early months of 1794 he accompanied the Netherlands financial minister on a mission to London, where he met the leading politicians of the day, and was much interested by the trial of Warren Hastings, then proceeding before Parliament. Before he had left London he was appointed ambassador extraordinary to the Hague. An English fleet carried him to his destination; but Lord Howe would not allow him to remain on board as a spectator of the famous action afterwards fought on 1 June. The advance of the French armies made it impossible for him to remain in the Netherlands,

and he therefore conducted his business from the Lower Rhine. For the same reason he was obliged to make a further retreat; the Metternich estates upon the Rhine were confiscated, and he was sent into Bohemia by his father to manage the only remaining family estates. In 1795 he was married to a granddaughter of the famous Prince Kaunitz. Until 1801 he was chiefly occupied in literary and scientific studies, and entertained some idea of abandoning the diplomatic profession. But in that year, after the Peace of Lunéville, he was offered the post of ambassador to Dresden, which he held for eighteen months amid the general agitation that pervaded Europe under the First Consulship of Napoleon. Dresden was unmoved by these alarms, and from this quiet post Metternich was able to gain useful experience of the diplomatic situation in Europe as a whole. In 1803 he was appointed to the embassy at Berlin, and proceeded to take up his post in the following year.

Napoleon had then been proclaimed emperor, and France was at war with Britain, which was striving to secure the co-operation of Austria and Prussia for the struggle in which the interests of Europe were involved. Austria was equally ready to help if only Prussia would join her; but Berlin was by no means decided. The patriotic party, led by Hardenberg, believed that Prussia and Austria in conjunction with Britain could alone save Europe from subjugation; but a strong opposition party was anxious to remain neutral, and hoped to secure Hanover as the price of neutrality. Metternich's task was to convince Prussia that her best interests lay in an alliance with Austria and Britain. He was supported by the Emperor Alexander of Russia, who was no less anxious to co-operate with Austria. The vacillation of the Berlin court was increased by the disaster of Ulm, and eventually Alexander came in person to Berlin to negotiate for the coalition which he had at heart. From that date began an intimacy between Metternich and the Tsar which soon reached the point of friendship. A treaty was signed, but the king of Prussia, in terror of the consequences, informed Napoleon of what he had done, and told him that he would be forced into an offensive alliance unless some term was put to the progress of the French armies. If, therefore, Metternich's labours produced no useful result, he had at least forced Prussia to declare herself, and the emperor confirmed his approval of his ambassador's action by appointing him to the embassy of Paris.

Metternich came to Paris after the battle of Austerlitz and the Peace of Pressburg, which broke up the old German empire and made French influence preponderant in central and southern Germany. It was at Napoleon's own request that he had been called to Paris; the diplomatist himself was anxious to go to St. Petersburg. He was on the most cordial terms with the Tsar, and he had a profound hatred for the French Revolution and all its works, of which he regarded Napoleon as the incarnation. At the same time he could not shrink from the task before him. Austria, though beaten,

was not discouraged, and the emperor thought that if he could gain time to reorganize, the struggle might be resumed with hope of success. The position, however, for the Austrian ambassador was extremely difficult. France was at war with Britain, and might be at war with Russia. Prussia had been glad to see the overthrow of her rival for the German hegemony, but was yet afraid that she would herself be the next victim. The new ambassador reached Paris in August, 1806, and at once had an interview with the minister for foreign affairs, Talleyrand. He forthwith explained his position and his desire to cultivate friendly relations, which were, however, in his own words, "not to be confused with submission". He was most kindly received in Paris by Napoleon and his court, and by society in general. Of a distinguished appearance and affable and courtly manner, with the conversational readiness which is particularly appreciated in France, and with every interest in making himself agreeable, he soon established his social position. Much of the information concerning his career at Paris and afterwards is best derived from his own *Memoirs*; these, however, must be used with caution. Conscious of his powers, Metternich was a conceited man, and he constantly re-edited his descriptions of events in the light of subsequent happenings. But he is perfectly correct in stating that Napoleon never made a greater mistake than when he invited himself to Paris. A cold and calculating character, a keen judge of men and affairs, and inspired by the most implacable hatred for Napoleon as an institution, his impressions of the emperor were not favourable; he regarded him as a somewhat theatrical figure, inclined to attitudinize for the purpose of imposing upon those about him. He was ready to ridicule the forms and ceremonies of the court and its tawdry attempts to imitate the splendour and formality of the old *régime*. He had the best of opportunities for studying Napoleon's character. The emperor was attracted by him, and their intercourse was something more than formal. Metternich fully recognized Napoleon's great qualities: the comprehensiveness of his intellect, the directness and vigour of his action, his wonderful penetration into the conflicting possibilities which might beset any course of action, and his readiness to modify his views when good reason could be shown. He also recognized in him a certain gambling spirit, a readiness to stake everything upon one throw, and to rely unduly upon the incapacity and errors of his adversaries. And in these defects he hoped that Austria might eventually find her opportunity.

Metternich was in Paris during Napoleon's Prussian campaign and after the Peace of Tilsit. His hopes for Austria began to rise when the emperor conceived his designs upon Spain, and the news of the Spanish successes confirmed this opinion. Napoleon's interests were becoming too widespread, and when his careful scrutiny was distracted Austria was able to increase her preparations. She secretly renewed her alliance with England, and began to mass forces upon

the frontier. Napoleon was aware that the catastrophe at Baylen, when the Spaniards forced 20,000 Frenchmen to surrender, would be a strong stimulus to Austrian aspirations. He therefore hastened back to Paris and demanded an explanation from Metternich on 15 August. The accounts of this famous interview as given by Metternich and by Thiers are divergent, but it is plain that Napoleon was not deceived by Metternich's protestations of neutrality. He was well aware that Austria was determined to use her opportunity at the very first moment, and he solemnly warned Metternich before the whole diplomatic body that the continuance of the Austrian policy could lead only to war. Metternich's business was to hide the Austrian preparations as far as possible, to stir up discontent with the emperor in Paris, to enter into friendly relations with foreign ministers, and to watch the best moment for beginning hostilities. Napoleon had a conference with the Austrian and Russian ambassadors at Erfurt on 27 September, returned to Paris in October, and at the end of that month set out for Spain. Meanwhile Metternich had drawn closer to Talleyrand, who had begun to intrigue against his master towards the end of 1808. Metternich then returned to Vienna and urged upon his cabinet that the moment for striking was at hand. Napoleon was fully occupied in Spain, Russia might be induced to join Austria, while the exasperation of the south German states might lead them to follow the same course. At this moment Metternich heard that Napoleon had abandoned the pursuit of the British and of Sir John Moore, and was returning to Paris. He hastened himself, in the same direction, and on 24 January, 1809, the emperor received the diplomatic body. He made no difference in his behaviour to Metternich, and had apparently been entirely deceived. The fact is that he was anxious to avert hostilities, for which he knew preparations had been made. The chancellor of the Russian empire, Romanoff, one of the few Russians whose confidence Metternich had failed to gain, had an interview with Napoleon shortly afterwards, in which the emperor used the well-known words: "It seems that the waters of Lethe and not the waters of the Danube wash the walls of Vienna. I have no interests to serve by a war with Austria, and all my efforts are directed to Spain, the battlefield which England has chosen; but unless Austria disarms I shall have to make upon her a war of destruction". Well aware that his pacific overtures would meet with no result, he also began to bring troops forward to meet the danger; but Austria, so far from being intimidated, felt convinced that she must strike at once. On 15 April Metternich was informed that he would be given his passport as soon as he could be exchanged against a member of the French embassy in Vienna. He reached Vienna on 5 June and found it in the occupation of the French. Napoleon might have been severely defeated at Aspern if the archduke Charles had not been prostrated for three hours by a nervous attack. Metternich received a hint that Napoleon was inclined to conclude hostilities if he would use his good offices to see whether any common ground

could be discovered. But Metternich somewhat haughtily declined, stating that he was practically a prisoner until an exchange could be affected. This event was not accomplished until three days before the battle of Wagram, on 2 July, which was gained for the French, chiefly owing to the disobedience of the Archduke John, who remained idle at Pressburg instead of joining his brother. Though the Austrians were defeated they were by no means routed; they could very well have fallen back upon Hungary and prolonged the war. Napoleon would then have been drawn farther from his base, with his best troops in Spain, and with discontented Germany around him. It was therefore obvious to him that the Emperor Francis must be induced to make peace.

Napoleon seems to have admitted that had Austria continued the war his position would have been very serious. Metternich and the Austrian emperor were fully aware of this fact, but the Archduke Charles committed a mistake which made the continuation of the war impossible. Instead of retreating to Hungary, joining hands with his brother John, and drawing the French troops far from their base, he fell back on Bohemia, the very ground which Napoleon himself would have chosen. The two armies were definitely separated, and nothing remained but to conclude peace. After weeks of negotiations Austria was forced to accept terms which, though humiliating, were the best that she could expect. She lost her Alpine frontier on the side of Italy, and the barrier of the Inn on the side of Bavaria. She lost also part of her Galician provinces, which were to be annexed to the Saxon Poland formed on the Vistula; her army was reduced to 150,000 men and was not to exceed that number. Metternich did not approve of the peace, and was a stranger to its terms and its conclusion, but after its ratification he became chancellor of the empire and minister for foreign affairs, and devoted himself, for the moment, to the task of seeing that its conditions were carried out. In spite of two successive defeats he still retained his confidence that sooner or later Napoleon might be overthrown.

Shortly afterwards an event, to him surprising, occurred. Napoleon sounded Madame Metternich with regard to the possibility of a marriage between himself and the Archduchess Marie Louise. The offer was referred by the Austrian ambassador at Paris to Vienna; the archduchess placed herself in her father's hands and was ready to be disposed of as the interests of Austria might demand. The emperor agreed to accept the offer, it being understood that no conditions should be attached to it upon either side, and after the marriage had been celebrated by proxy at Vienna, in March, 1810, Metternich set out for Paris. He wished to assure himself of the future attitude of France towards Austria and towards the Continent in general. Was Napoleon about to settle down and consolidate the conquests he had made, or did he propose to continue his devastating career? Had the marriage destroyed those revolutionary and democratic sentiments which the Revolution had brought to birth, and of which he regarded the emperor



PRINCE METTERNICH

After the painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A.

as the incarnation? He was unable to make up his mind, and not until he had a conversation with Napoleon concerning the election of Marshal Bernadotte to the throne of Sweden did he realize that Franco-Russian complications were possible. Metternich's conclusions were that in 1812 Napoleon would make preparations for a great attack upon Russia; in this event Austria should remain neutral, as circumstances might ultimately enable her to sway the balance of power between the contending nations. He also obtained from the emperor a revocation of the article in the treaty which limited the Austrian army to 150,000 men, and he then returned to Vienna. About this time the Russian minister, Count Schuvaloff, arrived at Vienna with proposals for a new alliance in case of war with France. Obviously the thoughts of both the Tsar and Napoleon had turned in the same direction. Metternich regarded Prussia as affording the most promising ground for future support. He explained to King Frederick William III the identity of their position with respect to Napoleon and their future interests. Thus his policy was to strengthen the Austrian forces and finances as far as he could, and wait the progress of events.

Throughout the year 1811 Napoleon was making his preparations, and calling up contingents from the allies. In the following year he requested from Austria and Prussia their active support in his undertaking. Prussia was obliged to yield, and Metternich believed that Napoleon required the Austrian contingent not so much for purposes of the campaign as for a guarantee that Austria would remain quiescent. He undertook, therefore, to furnish 30,000 troops for the invasion, upon conditions which promised the eventual recovery of the lost Illyrian provinces. But he asked that the agreement might be kept secret, in order that Austria might appear before Russia as neutral. The Tsar seems to have understood the situation, and not to have regarded Austria as a hostile power in spite of the fact that her troops had joined the invading army. The arrival of Napoleon at Dresden, on 17 May, was followed by the magnificent gathering of kings and princes to pay homage to the conqueror. Metternich's *Memoirs* state that Napoleon unfolded to him his plan of campaign:

My enterprise is one of those the solution of which is to be found in patience. Victory will attend the most patient. I shall open the campaign by crossing the Niemen; it will be concluded at Smolensk and Minsk; there I shall stop. I shall fortify these two points and occupy myself at Wilna, which will be my headquarters during the next winter, with the organization of Lithuania which is urgently impatient for deliverance from the yoke of Russia. I shall wait and see which of us is first wearied; I of feeding my army on the spoils of Russia or Alexander of sustaining my army at the expense of his country. Perhaps I may myself spend the most inclement months of the winter in Paris.

A plan so prudent and deliberate had every prospect of success, and Metternich's feelings may be well imagined as he followed the movements of Napoleon's army, and observed how the emperor was

abandoning this sketch of his operations. He saw that the winter spent at Moscow instead of at Smolensk might easily become a disaster. After the Borodino he came to understand that Napoleon was in much the same position as he had been at Vienna and Wagram, when he admitted that if Austria had refused peace he would have been in serious difficulties. There followed the frightful calamity of the retreat, and Metternich realized that Austria's opportunity had come.

He was, however, not so confident as were Prussia and Russia, that the great invader had been reduced to impotence, and he came to the conclusion that Austria's interests would best be served by the pursuit of a middle policy. Austria should maintain her strength upon a war footing and wait until the allies realized their incompetence to deal with Napoleon alone. On the other hand, Napoleon relied upon his marriage with the daughter of the house of Hapsburg, and might well be induced to think that Austria was his friend. Austria would then stand midway between the powers and thus assume the leadership. Hence the diplomatic movements immediately succeeding Napoleon's return were directed to secure his deposition. Napoleon and his councillors were prepared to apply to Austria for mediation, and Napoleon himself wrote to his father-in-law stating that he was willing to accept Austrian intervention. Austria's real intentions were hidden from him, for the reason that his eyes were blinded by the fatal marriage with Marie Louise, which thus eventually introduced a vicious principle into his foreign policy, and also alienated from him the sympathies of many of his own people.

If mediation were to be possible, war for the moment must be restrained, and Metternich's chief idea was to check the enthusiasm of Prussia and Saxony and of the German element in Austria, which, with Russia, was prepared to attack Napoleon. Such action would not only remove Austria from her position as mediator but might actually become the cause of her destruction. She would have to side with one or other of the parties, and at the moment it was impossible to say in which direction victory might incline. At the same time Metternich's attempts at intervention were everywhere rejected. Britain declined to listen to them; Russia asserted that no conditions could be made with Napoleon's insatiable ambition. Meanwhile Napoleon remained under the impression that he could defeat Russia and Prussia in combination, and that Austria would be prepared to share the spoils with himself. Far from restricting Austrian armaments, he had urged her to make regular preparations. He even proposed, in March, 1813, that Austria should send 100,000 men into Silesia, to attack the allies in flank while he made a frontal attack. And under this belief, or rather delusion, Napoleon began his campaign of April, 1813. Meanwhile Metternich, though holding the position of mediator, was in communication with Russia and Britain, and was prepared, unless Napoleon should prove himself irresistible, to support the allies with the troops which, at Napoleon's own instigation, he had mobilized. Metternich also succeeded in securing the

Metternich

co-operation of the king of Saxony and Bavaria in the event of such action taking place.

Meanwhile the French minister, M. de Narbonne, arrived in Vienna to discuss further action with Metternich. He came to the conclusion that the Austrians were not to be trusted, and informed his master that Metternich was playing a double game. Napoleon informed him that it was needless to insist upon an immediate declaration of Austria's policy, which would in any case become necessary in the course of the campaign. He won the battles of Lützen and Bautzen, and Metternich was obliged to throw off the mask. He declared that Austria could now seriously begin the work of intervention, and explained the conditions which he would consider. About this moment the French captured a courier at Dresden with dispatches from the Russian ambassador at Vienna to the Tsar; these provided abundant evidence of Austrian duplicity, and were full of excuses for Austrian backwardness in joining the Russians. The Austrian envoy was coldly received at Dresden by Napoleon, but he was able to produce a letter from the emperor. Napoleon was willing to trust his father-in-law if he mistrusted Metternich, and he granted an armistice at Pleiswitz when his best policy would have been to pursue the victories he had gained.

This armistice was a great mistake on Napoleon's part. He had inflicted a severe check upon Russia and Prussia, and was in a position to attack Austria in isolation. Metternich required, above all things, time to negotiate, not so much with Napoleon as with the Emperor Alexander, who was anxious to oblige Austria to declare her position one way or the other. If Austria should prove unwilling to take part against Napoleon, the Russian monarch was prepared to fall back upon his own territories and conclude the war. Napoleon, on the other hand, believed that the emperor of Austria would never declare war upon his own son-in-law, in which belief he was totally mistaken, and never were the disastrous consequences of his marriage more apparent. On 27 June a treaty was signed between Russia, Prussia, and Austria for the overthrow of Napoleon, an act of treachery which Napoleon would no doubt have detected had he not been deluded by his relationship to the emperor. Almost at the same moment Metternich had an interview with Napoleon to discuss the prospects of peace. He was able to gain time for his own negotiations, and on 10 August announced that Austria had declared war upon Napoleon, and that the allied troops might cross the Silesian frontier. Henceforward he was practically the guiding mind directing the movements of the allies. After Leipzig, when any one of the allies in isolation would have made peace with Napoleon, on condition that France should be left with her natural frontier, the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, Metternich had resolved upon dethroning the emperor. Any form of peace, in his opinion, would have merely amounted to an armistice which Napoleon could have denounced at any moment, and, with his implacable hostility to the Revolution and all its works, he could see no

alternative except the recall of the Bourbons to France or the presentation of the throne to some other dynasty. Among Metternich's strongest supporters in this policy was the Prussian general, Blücher, whose dearest wish was to sack Paris and hang Napoleon. After the emperor's abdication the choice of Elba as a residence was not decided by Metternich, who was strongly opposed to any arrangement which would leave Napoleon so near to France. Metternich seems even then to have thought of St. Helena, but the arrangements had been concluded before he could intervene.

His energies were then occupied by the Congress of Vienna, the spirit of which was well described by Frederick Gentz, an intimate friend of Metternich, who wrote:

The grand phrases, reconstruction of social order, regeneration of the political system, a lasting peace founded upon an equal division of strength, and so forth, were uttered to tranquillize the people and give an air of dignity and grandeur to the solemn assembly, but the real purpose of the Congress was to divide amongst the conquerors the spoils taken from the vanquished.

Almost every power wanted something, and the claims of the Russians and Prussians caused Metternich considerable anxiety. The former, who had professed to be acting in the interests of oppressed Europe, desired to grab the whole of Poland; the latter wished to absorb Saxony, and by degrees a line of cleavage separated Russia and Prussia from Austria, France, and Britain. But when it seemed within the bounds of possibility that the division of the spoils would lead to blows, these bickerings were checked by the news of Napoleon's return from Elba. Metternich's opinion that Elba was a mistaken choice of residence was fully justified. The powers immediately realized that in union alone was strength, and from Napoleon's point of view it was exceedingly unfortunate that he was unable to delay his return until the congress had broken up. Probably he might then have been able to play off the claims of one power against another. As it was, nothing had definitely been settled, and the uppermost feeling in the minds of the combatants was that if they did not take instant action there might be nothing to divide. Metternich took the lead when the allies first met to deliberate upon the new situation, and at his instance the announcement was made that the allies would make no terms with Napoleon.

After the second Peace of Paris, and the final deportation of Napoleon, the next document signed by Metternich on behalf of his master was the agreement embodying the Holy Alliance. This arose from a proposal made by the emperor of Russia, a narrow-minded and fanatical ruler who was constantly swayed by a species of religious mysticism, which occasionally made him the prey of such charlatans as Mme Krüdener. The Holy Alliance was instituted by Austria, Russia, and Prussia, and the main points of the agreement were that the contracting parties should assist one another mutually for the promotion of religion, peace, and justice. They were to regard them-

selves as commissioned by Providence to govern other nations upon Christian principles, to help one another as brothers, and to secure the welfare of their people in every way. A solemn address was issued on 26 September, 1815, in which the monarchs announced that they would henceforward rule in accordance with the principles of Christian life, and that they regarded themselves as the "plenipotentiaries of Heaven". Sooner or later all Christian sovereigns on the Continent except the Pope signed the agreement, though the British authorities naturally declined to have anything to do with it. This alliance, of course, had no connection with the political league guaranteeing the various treaties in which the conditions of the Congress of Vienna were embodied. In its origin it was simply a league of three despots, each guaranteeing to help the other against his subjects, and the control of it gradually fell into the hands of Metternich.

At the close of 1815 Europe presented a great opportunity for real statesmanship. After twenty-three years of warfare there was a general longing for peace and tranquillity; but there was an equally strong opinion prevalent that the people should receive some advantage from the victory which had been gained. In Germany, for instance, it was a national uprising which had enabled the country to contribute so largely to the overthrow of Napoleon, and the men who had fought from motives of pure patriotism considered that they should have at least some small share in the government of the country which they had sacrificed themselves to save. Much as Metternich hated the French revolution its spirit was very far from extinct. With greater or less intensity the three great ideas which it proclaimed had become the common property of thinking men throughout Europe. There was the idea of equality. As Christianity made men equal before God, so did the Revolution claim to make them equal in other spheres. There was, again, the idea of popular sovereignty. The theory of divine right was dead, no matter what efforts might be made to revive it; governors were held to derive their powers from the consent of the individual. Monarchs or their officials were but the servants of the people, and as such were responsible to them. And, lastly, there was the theory of nationality. Napoleon's signal disregard of the claims of heirs, the manner in which he dismembered states and created new political entities, had raised a general sentiment that the state and the nation should coincide, that the nation should be free to manage its own affairs and settle its own form of government undisturbed by outside interference. The history of the following seventy or eighty years was chiefly occupied by the struggles which brought these principles into practice, and at the outset Metternich had no intention of making the smallest concession to democratic, or, as he thought, revolutionary, sentiment. Conditions were discussed. Louis XVIII had been required by the terms of the Treaty of Paris to give France a constitution, and even he seems to have realized that the reign of absolutism was over. The congress recommended that the German princes should establish some form of popular constitution in each state, but very

European History

few countries received anything of the kind, and even where constitutions were granted they were aristocratic in type. The principle of the sovereignty of the people was nowhere wholeheartedly recognized and the commissioners at Vienna, led by Metternich, attempted to restore the autocratic Governments of the eighteenth century.

With Russia Metternich had little difficulty. The Tsar was willing enough to enounce ideas and sentiments couched in highfrown language, and Metternich was easily able to play upon his fears and use his enthusiasm for the support of the despotic system. With Prussia his task was not so easy. During the War of Liberation the German universities had fostered that spirit of freedom which naturally found expression in democratic institutions. In the year 1817 the students' association held a great festival to celebrate jointly the anniversary of Leipzig and of the Reformation. Their proceedings were made the more tumultuous by the fact that Frederick William, a vacillating ruler, had shown no inclination to fulfil the many promises which he had made to his people. Events were precipitated by the assassination of Kotzebue by a fanatical student, who thought that he was a German spy acting on behalf of absolutism to harden the heart of the emperor against all liberal claims. Metternich seized the opportunity to interfere, persuaded Frederick William to dismiss certain professors who were suspected of disseminating liberal ideas, and also called a conference of the German princes at Karlsbad. The Federal Diet which then met sanctioned certain resolutions which Metternich himself had drawn up, suspending the licence of the press, appointing commissions to investigate the German universities, and providing for the removal of liberal professors, while students' clubs were to be suppressed. The clause in the Treaty of Vienna suggesting the granting of constitutions was also abrogated at Metternich's instance. For the next ten years editors, tutors, and professors lost all opportunity of free thought, free speech, or freedom of government; espionage terrorized their public and invaded their private lives. Only in a few states of south Germany was there any measure of freedom or any semblance of popular government. Even more hardly did Metternich's hand press upon Italy. In Napoleon's early years the Italian states had welcomed his rule as likely to bring them the freedom which they so loudly proclaimed. Then his despotism had overburdened them with taxes, strewn battlefields with their best soldiers, and carried their art treasures to Paris; the Italians were therefore ready to help the allies and come forward in their turn under the name of liberators. But after Waterloo the Congress of Vienna, considering that the Italian peoples were chiefly imbued with revolutionary ideas, handed over the several states into which the Peninsula was divided to the dynasties which had ruled them before the Revolution. Austria appropriated Venice and Lombardy, and from that point of vantage directed the whole policy of the peninsula. Naples was restored to its old Bourbon rulers; the princes of the house of Hapsburg governed the petty states in the centre. The Pope and Victor Emmanuel II of Sardinia were native rulers, but they also

were absolutists, and the only free piece of territory in the whole of the peninsula was the little republic of San Marino. In the Papal States the Inquisition was reintroduced, and the press was kept under the strictest of censorships; even street lamps were abolished, as being a French innovation. The king of Sardinia actually destroyed the French furniture in his palace at Turin. When in 1820 the revolt of the Carbonari forced King Ferdinand, the ruler of the Two Sicilies, to grant his Neapolitan subjects a constitution, Metternich at once interfered. After consultation with the emperor of Russia and other parties to the Holy Alliance he was able to inform the liberal party in Naples that Austria would maintain the existing order of things, and could rely upon the support of Russia and Prussia if necessary. The resistance of the Neapolitans was easily crushed by the Austrians, who also suppressed a similar rising in Piedmont.

How the several countries of Europe fared under Metternich's system may be read in detail in the histories of Garibaldi, Mazzini, or any other popular leader who strove to throw off the yoke. It was in 1830 that Metternich's system was first put to the test, when, as usual, the July revolution in France gave the signal for every other revolutionist in Europe to be up and doing. These various risings were at first crushed with no great difficulty. Nicholas of Russia, who had succeeded Alexander as Tsar, repressed the disturbances in Poland. Metternich and the Austrians were able to do the same in Italy. In Germany the ruling princes were induced to accept an enactment binding them to reject petitions which might impair the power of the sovereign. When France, under Louis Philippe, seemed inclined to settle down under a new dynasty, which appeared chiefly anxious to secure its family interests, it appeared that the system was riveted upon Europe as strongly as ever. At the same time, in the years before 1848, Metternich was seriously disturbed by the work which Mazzini did in educating young Italy for its future responsibilities. The Italian patriot was shadowed by Metternich's agents, and on his hiding place in London and upon his newspaper, *Young Italy*, a careful watch was kept. Then there were difficulties with Hungary; the Hungarians had an ancient constitution of their own and a form of representative government which was almost traditional. The county assemblies might raise taxes and levy soldiers, but the legislative power of the country belonged to the Diet, a representative body. Metternich attempted to raise taxes unauthorized by the Diet and was obliged to convene it in 1825. Then was formed a constitutional opposition to Metternich's system which at first was devoted to a movement for the preservation of the Magyar language. In the Diet of 1832 the Hungarian patriot Kossuth first took the lead in support of the popular party. By 1839 Hungary was determined to resist Austrian predominance. Metternich decided that for his own peace of mind Kossuth must be imprisoned. But Metternich was obliged to release him and to make concessions upon various points, including the predominance of the Magyar language, and the

result of this friction was seen in 1847, when the Diet demanded the freedom of the press, equality of taxation, and the reform of peasant labour, all of which Metternich naturally refused to concede.

During these years the revolutionary party in Italy was steadily growing in strength. Pius IX and his liberal notions, in spite of the reaction which he afterwards underwent, were a great encouragement to the partisans of freedom. In the south of Italy the incompetent tyrant, Ferdinand II, was obviously preparing a revolution by his clumsy methods of repression. In Switzerland, Metternich was supporting the alliance known as the Sonderbund, formed by the seven Catholic cantons, who wished to preserve their cantonal sovereignty, which the proposal for a closer federal union was likely to abolish. He had also witnessed the defeat of these movements, for which he knew the British party was largely responsible. Meanwhile the small Germanic states were also moving against him. In Bavaria the subjects, tired of their king's profligacy, had forced him to abdicate, and had wrested a constitution from his successor. In Hesse-Darmstadt, Nassau, and elsewhere, rulers were persuaded or frightened into granting liberal measures.

Then came the Paris February revolution of 1848, which fired explosions in every quarter of Europe. The spirit of public feeling in Vienna caused Metternich serious alarm. In Germany there was a desire for union. A constitutional assembly was summoned at Frankfurt, while revolts broke out in Bohemia and in Hungary. The whole movement was directed against Metternich, and, thinking rather of the general safety than of himself, he resigned his office in preference to yielding a single point of his principles. The crowd had been fired by the speeches of Kossuth in the Hungarian Diet, and were ready to prepare for bloodshed if necessary. Metternich had but one remedy for diseases of this nature, the use of force, weighted as it was by the support of bayonets; he had forgotten the dictum of the French statesman, that you can do anything with bayonets except sit on them. The unwillingness of the soldiers to fire on the people made resistance impossible, and the man who had defied revolution for nearly thirty years was obliged to flee from revolution to England with all dispatch.

In 1851 he was able to return to his estates on the Rhine, and shortly afterwards he resided in Vienna. The rest of his life was uneventful. He was never offered office, and probably he would never have accepted it. Unofficial criticism he was able to give, and the new emperor, Francis Joseph, was ready to listen to it. He had no doubt many opportunities of deriving as much pleasure as may be had from the words: "I told you so;" more particularly when he saw a Napoleon seated on the throne of France within the next five years, and acknowledged as emperor by the whole of Europe. He saw his persistent enemies, France and Britain, allied in war against his oldest friend, the Russian emperor; he survived the battle of Magenta, which marked the overthrow of Austrian power in Italy,

but the news of that battle probably never reached him, for upon the day following he died.

In the arts of diplomacy he was probably unsurpassed. A man of very high accomplishments, a good talker, possessing an impassive and inscrutable demeanour, which in his day was almost a necessary adjunct of the profession, he was able to reinforce these natural qualities by an infinite patience and a great power of penetration. The real triumph of his life was his defeat of Napoleon. For seven years he completely imposed upon the emperor. The social upstart was dominated by his aristocrat bearing, and to Metternich he gave more confidence than to any ambassador at his court, though no ambassador should have been regarded with more suspicion and distrust. No more cold-blooded cleverness was ever displayed than that which Metternich showed in bringing about the Austrian marriage. A word from him would have stopped the negotiations, but the word remained unspoken, because he foresaw that reliance upon Austria would lead Napoleon into adventures from which Austria might derive her independence. And if the overthrow of Napoleon was an advantage to Europe, as indeed it was, Metternich deserves as much credit for the achievement as any nation or any general. But the unwavering hostility to revolution and its principles which enabled him to defeat Napoleon became the cause of his own overthrow. Obliged to grapple with national aspirations, and called upon to define the progress of national tendencies, he dismally failed. Unable to accommodate himself to new conditions, he attempted to restore the forms and systems of government which Europe had outgrown. He spoke of Napoleon's empire as an artificial structure founded by brute force, but his own system was no better; and as Napoleon's empire collapsed upon his fall, so Metternich's system has vanished irrevocably.

CHAPTER X

Simon Bolivar (A.D. 1783-1830)

For three centuries Spain ruled enormous dominions in the New World—Mexico, Guatemala, Venezuela, New Granada, Peru, Chili, Buenos Ayres—which she owed to the so-called *conquistadores*, men such as Cortes, Pizarro, or Quesada. Their adventures have been surrounded by such writers as Prescott with the glamour which invariably attaches to the conquests of the pioneer in unknown countries. As a matter of fact their progress was stimulated by the lust for wealth, and their acquisition of it was constantly marked by ruthless cruelty. It was obvious that they could not be left in charge of an empire twice the size of Europe, and in 1542 Spain began to legislate for the government of her colonial dominions. With the best will in the world, legislation would have been a difficult matter. Spain was genuinely anxious for the benefit of the subject populations, but administrators at a distance of several thousand miles attempted to solve problems, which they never fully understood, upon principles of government akin to those of mediæval feudalism. The nobles who were sent out from the mother country felt that they must make the most of their opportunities, and their chief object while in office was to amass a sufficient competency to justify an early retirement. Control, moreover, over a vast and thinly populated area was often weak or non-existent; mine owners who wished to exploit the labour of the natives regardless of their health and happiness usually found few obstacles in their way. As time went on the population of Spanish South America became gradually more mixed. The majority of Spaniards saw no practical difference between one Indian tribe and another; and even as some English people have a vague idea that India is populated by one tribe of natives, so the Spaniards did not trouble to distinguish between the Incas of Peru and the savage tribes in the central forests. These racial differences, however, were very strongly marked, and were accentuated by intermarriage between the Spaniards and the Indians. The offspring of such unions gradually formed a mixed race into which an additional strain was introduced when negro importation began. The continent thus had three original colours, white, red, and black, through the intermarriage of which sprang three half-breed classes, known as the Mestizoes or Spanish Indians, the Mulattoes or Spanish Negroes, and the Zamboes or Negro Indians. Further combination of these types produced a population extraordi-

narily heterogeneous. Then arose a class distinction—the importance of which entirely overshadowed racial differences—between temporary immigrants from Spain and Spaniards who had grown up in the country, who were known as Creoles, a term which in its original sense implied no admixture of dark blood. It was among this latter class that the revolt against Spain arose, and the half-breed native population was of no political importance in the struggle, and was generally inclined to follow personal likes and dislikes. Spanish policy favoured, not the creole, or trueborn American Spaniard, but the needy immigrant who came to take up office for a while in the hope of acquiring a fortune. Theoretically the creole was eligible for office, but in practice he very rarely obtained it. The natural result was discontent, not so much with the home Government as with the overbearing attitude, the avarice, and incompetency of those who were sent to govern the country. Probably had the creole been granted a fair share of office, and its spoils, Bolivar would have found little opportunity for the exercise of his peculiar faculties. The colonies as such also had their grievances. Spain, for instance, would not allow them to manufacture anything which she could supply herself, and they were therefore obliged to support a home monopoly. Trade with other countries was almost prohibited; colonial government was carried on by the Spanish monarch through the Council of the Indies. The natives of the colonies were regarded as upon an equal footing with the inhabitants of Castille, but they were entirely subject to the Spanish officials sent out to govern them, who could interpret the laws as they chose, uncontrolled by the far-distant home Government. The head of the South American ministry was at first the viceroy of Peru, who resided at Lima. When it was found that one man could not successfully administer so vast a territory, two new viceroys and two captains-general were appointed, and a later sub-division of the provinces into departments was made, the viceroys or captains-general being as a rule military commanders of the provincial forces.

Yet with all these grievances there was no serious revolt until the early years of the nineteenth century, and even at that time revolutionary movements generally showed much loyalty to the ruling house of Spain. The theory that about 1810 the whole of South America was ripe for freedom, and was pervaded by a universal longing for independence, is far from correct. Notwithstanding the influence of the colonial war in North America, and of the French Revolution, the project of an independent South America existed only in the heads of a few men who had acquired enthusiasm for modern ideas in the course of foreign travel. The South American Spaniard was by nature apathetic and by circumstances ignorant; teaching was confined to religion and law and a smattering of selected literature. There was no public press to speak of, and books were subjected to the severest scrutiny. North American ideas were carried across the Atlantic, and only after their development in France did they return to South America with influential power. In the early

European History

years of the War of Independence it was impossible to rouse any resistance to Spanish supremacy in some provinces, while in others the movement collapsed, and the province readily returned to the Spanish domination upon the first sign of defeat. It is very doubtful whether the Spanish American colonies were ready for rebellion, or were capable of utilizing success, when Napoleon's victories in Spain offered them their chance. Granted that they were ripe for revolt from a corrupt, tyrannical, and selfish Government, the future course of events shows them by no means prepared for independence. Comparing the results with the United States, we see in the north steady progress and in the south a continual series of rebellions; peace has never been assured except by the temporary supremacy of some military dictator. For a republican Government the people were wholly incompetent, and one leader of the revolt, San Martin, was fully convinced of this fact. If Bolivar ever sincerely believed in republicanism he undoubtedly changed his views before his death.

Bolivar was born on 24 July, 1783, in Caracas. His father died when he was quite young, and he lost his mother in 1789. His maternal uncle, who became his guardian, was an indolent character, and showed little interest in the boy's education. The young Simon was no doubt idle and unruly, and in 1799 his uncle conceived the idea of sending him to Spain to complete his education. He lived for a time in Madrid, where he fell in love with his future wife, Maria Theresa, the niece of the Marquis de Toro of Caracas. As Bolivar was only eighteen and the girl but fifteen their marriage was delayed until 1802. Much of the intervening time was spent by Bolivar in Paris, where he became a warm admirer of the republic. In 1802, after his marriage, Bolivar returned to Venezuela with his wife, who died a few months after his arrival, leaving him a childless widower at the age of nineteen. In the following year he returned to Cadiz, and in 1804 he was in Paris. Napoleon had been declared emperor, much to the disappointment of Bolivar, who lost his former admiration for the republican hero. He read energetically in Paris, learnt French and Italian fluently, and could understand English; paid a visit to Rome, and returned to Caracas at the end of 1806. An attempt had already been made to start a revolution by Miranda, who had fitted out a small expedition in New York, and twice effected a landing on the coast of Venezuela. On the first occasion he was unable to maintain his footing; the second time he succeeded in capturing the town of Coro, but the better classes were hostile, and the mass of the people indifferent. The British in Jamaica refused to help him, and he was obliged to abandon an attempt which showed no prospect of success. Then in 1808 and 1809 the situation was changed by the course of events in Spain. Napoleon persuaded Ferdinand VII and Charles IV to renounce their claims to the Spanish crown, which was given to his brother Joseph. Probably if Napoleon had been able to secure the general recognition of Joseph on the part of Spain the colonies would

quietly have accepted the change. The appearance of the Portuguese court and Government in Rio Janeiro after Junot's invasion of Portugal in November, 1807, naturally caused considerable excitement throughout Spanish South America, and the colonies joined in a general protest against Napoleon's attempt to force king Joseph upon Spain. Then followed reports of the national rising and the capture of Madrid, and the colonies were obliged to ask themselves whether the Spanish regency and the junta were representatives of Ferdinand VII. In many parts of South America, colonies which were dissatisfied with the old Spanish representatives drove out the viceroys and governors and compelled them to renounce the authority which had ended with the captivity of their prince. They formed regencies and juntas of their own, regarding themselves as the representatives of Ferdinand VII and the legal successors of the Spanish officials whom they had ousted. In some cases the dispossessed governors gained a following among the people and succeeded in recovering their authority. Such was the case at Caracas in 1809, where a junta was set up to which Bolivar offered his services. He was appointed lieutenant-colonel of the militia, and when the junta resolved to send a mission to England, to inform the Government of recent events, Bolivar was sent as head of the embassy. To the marquis of Wellesley, then secretary of state for foreign affairs, he seems to have betrayed his own ideals of independence, which the marquis was not likely to encourage, as Britain was then in alliance with Spain. His proposals for a *modus vivendi* with Spain did not satisfy the Venezuelan Government, which actually applied to Napoleon for help. However, Napoleon's hands were full in Europe, and he was powerless upon the sea.

Bolivar went to London with a definite purpose, the hope of interesting Miranda in the cause of colonial independence. Miranda had been a soldier of fortune, and had travelled over almost the whole of Europe, and after the failure above described he had returned to England. He was a genuine republican at heart, and, what was more, the only capable soldier in the service of the Venezuelan Government. He returned to Caracas with Bolivar at the end of 1810. His presence does not seem to have been particularly desired, and Bolivar far exceeded his instructions in bringing him back. However, he was admitted to the republican congress which met in 1811 in the name of Ferdinand VII. The former Spanish authority had remained unshaken in the outlying parts of the province, and by June the new Government was confronted with a vast conspiracy. Miranda, Bolivar, and others seized the opportunity to declare Venezuela independent of Spain, the tricolour flag was adopted and a manifesto issued declaring that the Spanish Government had been shattered by Napoleon. Venezuela as a whole by no means accepted the declaration; even in the capital there was a strong party against it, while the inhabitants of the more southern plains were definitely opposed to any scheme of the kind. The royalists were therefore soon able to take the offensive, and in any case the cause of the republican Government was sealed by a frightful earthquake which

European History

took place on 26 March, 1812. Caracas and other towns along the coast were soon reduced to heaps of ruins, and the total loss of life from this disaster was estimated to reach nearly 120,000. The clergy, who were for the most part royalists, made the most of their opportunity by explaining the disaster as the judgment of Heaven upon the rebels. As a matter of fact the royalist provinces had suffered but little, while a large number of republican troops had perished in the convulsion. The royalists were therefore able to secure the upper hand, and Miranda was eventually betrayed and handed over to them by those who professed to be the leaders of the republican party, including Bolivar. The unfortunate Miranda eventually died in prison in Cadiz, worn out by suffering and misery. A reign of terror followed in Caracas, but Bolivar's share in the arrest of Miranda saved his life, and he was able to leave Caracas in August, 1812, when he was twenty-nine years of age.

He was small in stature, narrow-chested, with slender limbs and small hands and feet. The chief feature of his countenance was his black and piercing eyes. His sallow skin and the wrinkles on his forehead, a peculiarity even of his youth, gave him a slight resemblance to a monkey, upon which score he was exceedingly touchy. He was capable of great physical exertion, and ready to undertake it, and by no means afraid of hard work. An element of self-conceit is apparent even in the style of his proclamations, in which self-glorification is far too prominent. The bombastic nature of their language is a defect for which he was hardly accountable. His habits of life were simple, though there seems little doubt that his youth in Paris was given up to debauchery. He was not popular with his followers—both his temper and his language were violent—but at the same time he could, when he chose, exert wonderful powers of persuasion. After the failure of the revolution in Caracas he made his way to New Granada.

At Cartagena he was well received by the local dictator, and issued a proclamation explaining the causes of the failure in Venezuela from his own point of view, and urging that Granada should undertake the work of reconquering Caracas. Meanwhile he was given a command in an expedition which was to attack the Spanish posts in the interior. He succeeded in clearing 300 miles of the lower Magdalena River and capturing many boats and munitions of war. He hoped that this success would bring many recruits to his standard, and a brilliant march across the Cordilleras with only 400 men enabled him to defeat the Spaniards and reach the western gate of Venezuela. Since his departure from that country, seven months before, the royalist Government had failed to conciliate the feelings of the people. Bolivar was convinced that an invasion would be immediately attended with success. The congress of New Granada, however, was not inclined to support him with any vigour until it discovered that the Venezuelan population greeted Bolivar with enthusiasm. A succession of skirmishes brought the liberator as far as Caracas, which eventually capitulated. The Spanish authorities escaped, and Bolivar and his



(122)

SIMON BOLIVAR

Statue at Lima, Peru

Photo, Underwood and Underwood

troops entered the town in triumph, amid shouts of "Long live the liberator!" He undertook to accept no office except a military command, and made loud professions of his republican intentions. On the boundary of Guiana another liberator had also arisen, but these two were unable to combine against their common enemy, the Spaniards, and were chiefly occupied with securing their personal supremacy. Under pressure from the half-breed native population Bolivar had declared a war of extermination against the Spaniards, and all who were not willing to support the republicans were reckoned as Spaniards. This was a fatal mistake. Bolivar disgraced his cause, nor was he strong enough to carry out so sweeping a measure even had it been necessary. The one strong point on the coast, Puerto Cabello, was still in the hands of the Spaniards, and Bolivar was at length forced to fall back upon Caracas. The hostility of the country districts proved his ruin. He attempted to give his dictatorship a legal basis by calling together a congress at Caracas. Equally useless was his attempt to conclude an alliance with the liberator in the eastern provinces. The royalist party was obviously too strong, and all far-sighted persons rallied to its support. Bolivar was repeatedly and severely defeated, and hardly escaped the fate to which he had himself betrayed Miranda. By the end of 1813 the whole of Venezuela was once more in the hands of the royalists, who were now free to act against New Granada, the republican strength of which had been exhausted by Bolivar in the course of his Venezuelan campaign.

Meanwhile the revolutionary movement in the south had also proved abortive. In the states of La Plata the bulk of the people showed no special enthusiasm for revolt, and in Buenos Ayres the upper and middle classes were no more energetic than those at Caracas. The new junta continued to rule in the name of Ferdinand VII, and eventually captured Montevideo; but the usual separatist tendency manifested itself, and the number of Governments which rapidly succeeded one another destroyed all possibility of united action. Time was spent in struggling against decentralization instead of collecting resources for national action. The royalist cause was thus able to gain a temporary triumph. Meanwhile Bolivar had taken refuge in Jamaica, and while there he heard that Spain was making a desperate effort to recover her lost colonies. A great expedition of twenty-five warships and fifty transports, with 10,000 men, put to sea under General Morillo in March, 1815. Venezuela was chosen as the point of attack, for the reason that the southern provinces nominally professed allegiance to Ferdinand VII, while Montevideo was in the possession of the republicans. If Morillo succeeded in subduing Venezuela he could afterwards make his way to the La Plata region through Bolivia. He encountered little resistance in Caracas and was able to sweep the country. Cartagena was captured, after a heroic resistance which lasted for 108 days, when such of the defenders as had survived famine and disease escaped to San Domingo, after spiking their guns and destroying their ammunition. Meanwhile a second Spanish army

vegetation or animal life. However, upon reaching the district near Sogomosa, their toils were forgotten in a climate which could only be described as one of eternal spring. The Spanish commander now realized that his flank had been turned by this march, while it was all-important for Bolívar to force an action before his enemy could summon reinforcements. He succeeded by a series of marches and countermarches in seizing the town of Tunja and thus cutting off the advance of the Spaniards to the capital. They tried to force a passage, and the result was the battle of Boyacá, which ended in the capture of all the artillery and military stores of the enemy and the annihilation of their army. Bolívar was able to enter Bogotá with the proud title of liberator of New Granada. He had indeed won a really decisive victory, and the first step in the final liberation of the country from Spanish domination had been taken. He had also shown the greatest courage and determination in the prosecution of his arduous march and had displayed strategical capacity of a high order. Bolívar again created a new civil government by the side of his military dictatorship, and cleared the way for the union of Venezuela and New Granada as the Republic of Colombia.

Meanwhile the Spanish general, Morillo, had been greatly hampered by events at home. Ferdinand VII upon his return to his own kingdom from France in 1814 attempted to set up an absolutism, and his abolition of every liberal institution led to various revolts. It seemed to him that an excellent means of removing these dangerous elements was to send them to South America, but the concentration of them at Cadiz and an outbreak of yellow fever there led to a general revolt, the leaders of which declared their intention of restoring the constitution of 1812. Consequently those who had fought for the restoration of the Spanish dominions since 1814 had no longer any legal status, while the prospect of a Spanish expedition naturally came to an end, to the delight of Bolívar and the regret of Morillo. Morillo was now ordered to proclaim a new constitution, to release political prisoners, and to open negotiations with the Venezuelan patriots. He obeyed with considerable disgust. It was obvious that matters had gone too far, and that one party or the other must be overthrown. Bolívar was well aware of the new position of affairs in Spain, and was willing to open negotiations; but he insisted that the Colombian republic should be recognized first. At length, after a considerable amount of haggling, it was agreed that a six months' armistice should be proclaimed and a treaty signed for the regularization of the war, which was henceforward to be carried on as between civilized nations, not between savages. Bolívar and Morillo met and talked over their adventures, and shortly afterward, Morillo, who had been superseded in his command, left the country for Spain, and disappears from this portion of history. He was probably glad to go; he realized that it could only be a question of time until his forces were worn out by enemies who had a whole population to draw upon for recruits.

Bolivar himself was convinced that a permanent peace with Spain was impossible. As far as the colonists were concerned the new constitution in no way guaranteed their complete independence, and many of them had been too far compromised to be satisfied with any other settlement. War broke out again in the spring of 1821, after both parties had spent the interval in preparing for hostilities. The success of the liberator in the highlands was now comparatively assured, and afforded him a better prospect of success in attacking Venezuela and Caracas, where the royalists were making their last stand. The coast towns were in the hands of the Spaniards, but otherwise they were masters only of the territory which their troops could occupy. Bolivar met a royalist force at Carabobo, a battle which was won for him by the bravery of the British legion, many of whom were Peninsula and Waterloo veterans. Bolivar himself acknowledged their valour, and is said to have saluted them as they passed him after the battle with the words: "Saviours of my country!" The Spaniards were forced to evacuate the central part of the province and to take refuge in Puerto Cabello, while Bolivar proclaimed Caracas's independence, which was now permanently secured. At the same time the congress of Cúcuta had met on 12 July and had sanctioned the constitution of 1819. The republic was centralized and the territory divided into departments and sub-departments. The legislature consisted of two chambers, a senate and a chamber of representatives, while the executive power was in the hands of a president, elected for four years, assisted by a council of government of five. The president's power was greatly limited, and was never absolute except in the case of a foreign invasion or of civil war. In short, as Bolivar neatly put it, "the Government of Colombia was either a gentle rivulet or a devastating torrent". During his time the torrential character was by far the more prominent. The Congress begged the liberator to come and direct their deliberations. He made a great show of refusal, but his indisputable services were by no means undervalued and his resignation of office was not accepted. On the other hand, the Congress did not place itself unconditionally in his hands. He was given the position of president of Colombia, but it was enacted that he could not, as such, exercise civil authority while he was at the head of the army upon service. A vice-president was appointed to provide for this contingency. The Congress also passed a law forbidding any change in the constitution for the next ten years: no constitution had yet had a fair trial, as every successful party leader had overthrown whatever organization he found. Bolivar agreed to these conditions, and the new republic gained a further success in the capture of Cartagena. The isthmus provinces threw off their allegiance to Spain and requested admittance to the Colombian republic. By the fall of Cumana the Spanish possessions were reduced to the one stronghold of Puerto Cabello, which was held by some 4000 troops. It was stormed by Paez, in November, 1823, and the Spanish troops were shipped to

Cuba. By the end of the year Venezuela and New Granada were cleared of Spanish troops with the exception of a few guerrillas who maintained a hopeless resistance.

Interest now shifts for a moment to the south. A revolt in Quito had been suppressed in 1812, and after eight years of quiet submission to Spanish rule a revolution broke out in October, 1820, at Guayaquil. Bolivar had already sent one of his subordinates, Sucre, with the object of attaching it to the new republic of Colombia if it could be helped to maintain its independence. There was, however, another liberator who was no less anxious to secure possession of Guayaquil, and who was in many respects an even more capable character than Bolivar. This was José de San Martín, who had fought for Spain during the Peninsular War and had then returned to Buenos Ayres. Unlike Bolivar, he was not consumed by a desire for the outward show of power, and was anxious to improve the prospects of his country. He was not a republican in Bolivar's sense. Like many of his contemporaries he was convinced that Spanish South America was neither sufficiently civilized nor sufficiently politically educated to conduct a republican form of government upon the principles of the United States and the North. The outward show of liberty often served the selfish needs of individuals, with the result that Spanish oppression was replaced by something worse, or that civil war became chronic. He therefore resolved to drive the Spaniards from the southern provinces, and for this purpose it was obvious that he must secure possession of the Peruvian highlands on both sides of the Cordilleras. Otherwise, holding command of the Pacific, the Spaniards could land forces without difficulty at any point for attacks upon the patriots. San Martín spent two years in collecting and training troops for his campaign. He was an experienced soldier and a capable organizer, and when he began his movement the plan of campaign which he had worked out was successful in every detail. He was able to cross the Andes and take the Spaniards by surprise, and in 1818 secured possession of Santiago. By the time Bolívar had cleared the Spaniards out of the north, San Martín was able to proclaim the independence of Peru, and himself assumed the title of protector. His success, however, was by no means complete. The Peruvians were less energetic and less inspired by republican ideas, and the new Government was in a position of constant danger, while the royalists were able to retire upon Bolivia and to reconstruct their forces after the defeat. San Martín, however, who regarded the struggle for independence as a matter affecting the interests of all the colonies, attempted to come to an understanding with Bolivar, and the case of Guayaquil provided an excuse for serious discussion of the subject.

Guayaquil was on the boundary line between Peru and Quito, and its local junta had placed it under the protection of both liberators, with the object of avoiding any dispute upon the question to which

province the town belonged. Quito was still within Spanish dominions, for the results of the victory of Boyacá did not prove quite so extensive as Bolívar had hoped, and in the provinces of Popayán and Pasto the population was energetically loyalist. Bolívar therefore proposed a joint attack upon Quito. His general, Sucre, was sent to Guayaquil to advance upon the town from the east while Bolívar proposed to turn the loyalist opposition on the north. Sucre's attempt was a failure. He won two skirmishes but was eventually severely defeated, while Bolívar had a desperate struggle at Bomboná. His attempt to pass Pasto was barred by the fact that the bridges over the intervening river had been destroyed. While he marched up the banks for the purpose of crossing at a higher point he was confronted by 2000 Spanish troops with a number of local auxiliaries to whom the country was perfectly familiar. The battle of Bomboná cost him 500 casualties out of a force of 2000, and though he defeated the enemy he was unable to make any headway. He was therefore obliged to abandon the conquest of Quito and retire to the north-west. Meanwhile Sucre had been reinforced with great unselfishness by San Martín, who lent him a sufficient number of troops to take the offensive against Quito. With these he gained a decisive victory at the battle of Pichincha, and Quito surrendered immediately. The loss of this town made it impossible for the Spaniards to continue any serious resistance in Ecuador, and Bolívar was thus enabled to advance upon his original route. He was received in triumph when he entered Quito in June, 1822, but his success had only been due to the strategy of Sucre, whose services were very inadequately acknowledged. San Martín, who was a wholehearted patriot, hoped that this victory might be followed by a second united campaign against Bolivia, and arranged for a meeting with Bolívar at Guayaquil. The liberator had already incorporated Quito in the Colombian republic, regardless of the fact that Peruvian forces had aided in its conquest, and he was quite determined to secure possession of Guayaquil. But here his title was doubtful. The Spaniards themselves were not sure to which province the town belonged. When, therefore, San Martín landed and was received with full military honours by Bolívar and his staff, he realized that the Venezuelan had already settled the matter, and that Guayaquil was lost to Peru. The accounts of what happened in the course of their interview are contradictory, but the fact remains that the two generals were unable to come to an understanding, and the probability is that Bolívar's demands were excessive and that their policies were incompatible. San Martín did not believe that republicanism would ever flourish in South America. In Chili and Buenos Ayres the recent republican Governments were tottering upon the verge of collapse, while his experiences in Peru had taught him the depth of national feeling in favour of monarchy. Moreover, a constitutional monarchy had been introduced into the neighbouring empire of Brazil without any serious disturbance. Every argument, therefore, seemed to point to

monarchy as the future constitutional form. Hence San Martin desired to establish a great South American constitutional monarchy with a younger prince of the royal house of Spain at its head, and had sent an ambassador to Spain to open negotiations for that purpose. He had hoped that the republic of Colombia would fall in with this idea, but the meeting with Bolivar showed him that these hopes were impossible. Nor was Peru itself so favourable to his monarchical proposals as he had supposed. He therefore concluded that the best course for him was to retire, and thus to avoid the inevitable disasters either of civil war or of a struggle with Bolivar. When the constituent Congress met at Lima, on 20 September, 1822, he formally resigned his command and left Peru to shift for herself. In general disgust with his experiences he retired to Europe, where he spent the remainder of his life in seclusion.

The course of events largely justified his forebodings. The Peruvian army immediately suffered two severe defeats and seemed likely to collapse before the superior forces of Spain. Bolivar immediately resolved to send reinforcements into the country, clearly seeing that if the Spaniards reoccupied Lima and Callao they would not only obtain a strong basis of operations but might soon turn public opinion, which had never been strongly republican, in favour of the royalist Government. The decision was a bold one, as troubles had broken out in Venezuela, and Bolivar himself was obliged to start for Bogotá. However, he was soon able to return, and upon reaching Callao he found a fearful state of confusion. The Peruvian forces were constantly deserting, the Spaniards were gaining ground every day, and finally Callao itself hoisted the Spanish flag, an example followed by Lima. It seemed that Peru was lost to the republican cause.

The royalist army, however, had been stirred to discontent by the suppression of the liberal Government in Spain, and Bolivar had reorganized the army among the northern mountains and had brought up reinforcements from New Granada. By 29 July, 1824, the liberator was able to concentrate the whole of his force at Sacramento, 12,000 feet above the sea level, and he then reviewed some 9000 men. Advancing southwards he came across the Spaniards in one or two marches, and defeated them in the so-called battle of Junin, a cavalry action in which hardly a shot was fired. The royalist leader was obliged to fall back upon Cuzco, 450 miles away, while Bolivar's pursuit was hampered by the outset of the rainy season before he could reach the enemy upon the banks of the Apurimac. He therefore returned to the coast to fetch reinforcements, leaving Sucre in command of the army, and impressed the utmost caution upon him. The liberator then received an act from the Congress of Colombia depriving him of his extraordinary military powers as dictator, an act inspired by the head of the executive power, Santander. The ostensible excuse was the fact that Bolivar, who was now dictator of Peru, could not constitutionally continue to exert full authority in Colombia at the same time. Bolivar then placed Sucre in supreme

command of the troops, and informed him that he need apprehend no interference from himself. The Spaniards had organized a large force at Cuzco for the purpose of avenging the defeat of Junin. Their efforts collected some 11,000 men, who left Cuzco at the end of October. Sucre was convinced that he could not hope to engage so superior a force with any prospect of success, and therefore resolved to retreat in accordance with Bolivar's instructions. During the early part of December the two armies were moving upon opposite and parallel lines of hills, and constant skirmishes took place, while the exhaustion of the march in rarefied air at great altitudes, with the exertion necessary to cross deep gorges and to march upon primitive roads, tried the troops most severely. By 8 December the republican army had reached the plain of Ayacucho, confronting the royalist army upon the summit of the steep height. Sucre's position now seemed desperate: it was impossible for him to avoid a battle, and if he was defeated destruction was inevitable. To the royalist's twenty-four guns he could oppose only one, while his numbers were inferior. At 9 a.m. on 9 December the royalists began to descend the heights which they had occupied, the cavalry dismounting and leading their horses. Sucre allowed them to reach the foot of the heights and then delivered a bayonet charge before they could re-form. The arrival of the Colombian cavalry decided the engagement in this direction and the Spaniards were scattered in every quarter. On the left the Peruvians and Colombian infantry fought with the courage of despair, and the royalists were eventually defeated with the loss of 2000 men and fifteen guns. Nearly 4000 officers and men, with the generals in command, became prisoners of war, while the remaining survivors were scattered over the face of the country. This battle decided the fate of Peru and the independence of South America. The terms of the capitulation arranged that all Spanish soldiers desiring to leave South America should be transported to their own country. Sucre saw that the terms were honourably observed and that the Spanish were able to leave the country unmolested. Further opposition was hopeless. In Callao the Spanish commander held out for some months, but upper Peru and Bolivia soon laid down their arms. It now remained to find some form of constitution under which the liberated states might be able to live.

The remainder of Bolivar's life is occupied with draft constitutions, with plots and counterplots, with incipient revolutions, intrigues and cabals, all of which form a dreary and unprofitable wilderness. From the outset he had been unpopular in Peru, while his dictatorial power had brought him under the suspicion of the republican party even in New Granada. A number of ambitious generals and a swarm of office seekers considered that they could only benefit by a change of leadership. Since 1826 a strong party in Venezuela, headed by Paez, had urged the separation of that country from the Colombian republic; when Bolivar succeeded in averting this act he was confronted by a similar movement in Peru. The Peruvian

dictator declared war against Colombia, and was defeated and overthrown by Sucre. Meanwhile Bolivar was struggling against a tide of opposition. Several times he abdicated, only to resume the government the next moment; but his enemies were determined to get rid of him by a plot for his assassination. A military rising for this purpose took place at Bogotá, on 25 September, 1828, and the liberator only escaped with his life by dropping half-dressed from his bedroom window and hiding under a bridge until the loyalist officers were able to collect their men. It was obvious to him that the situation was becoming impossible. No sooner was one insurrection suppressed than another sprang up, and finally, in 1830, Bolivar informed Congress that his weak health made it impossible for him to remain in power. The statement was entirely true. He had suffered severely from fever in recent years, and felt himself unable to continue the struggle. Congress gave him the thanks of the nation and an annual pension, a very necessary provision, for he had lost far more than he had gained in the service of his country; he died a poor man. He retired to a house near Cartagena, and there received a heavy blow in the news of the assassination of his old friend and general, Sucre, who was killed by a party of assassins in the mountains of Pasto. Shortly afterwards he caught a bad cold, which ended in consumption, and on 17 December, 1830, he breathed his last, at the age of forty-seven. A life of constant and strenuous mental and physical exertion had reduced him to a wreck.

The most various estimates of his character have been given, but all who have judged him are agreed that his financial probity was unimpeachable, and that he never abused opportunities for self-enrichment such as few men have enjoyed. Vanity and ambition have been constantly attributed to him. He was ready to swallow flattery upon every occasion, but such self-complacency is rather a fault of his race. Ambitious he certainly was in his later days, but it was not in personal ambition that he first conceived his great idea of liberating South America from Spanish rule. This purpose was implanted in him by his experiences in Europe, and his ambition began when he realized his superiority to the other leading men of his country. He became impressed with the belief that he was absolutely essential to the cause of liberation, and he was therefore ambitious for supreme power. The result was a fit of megalomania. The republic of Colombia was in itself an idea impossibly vast, and the notions which he entertained of a great South American Federation were totally impracticable. He seems never to have realized the enormous difference existing between the civilized and cultivated peoples of Europe and the uneducated and heterogeneous races of South America, who had been for centuries purposely kept in a state of benighted ignorance by the governing power. Thus the later years of his life were a continual series of disappointments. The fact was forced upon him that his administrative machinery would not work, owing to the utter incapacity of the administrators. Whenever his back was turned jobbery and fraud

reigned paramount, and the contrast between his bombastic manifestos and elaborate draft constitutions and the miserable reality which was produced must have depressed even the liberator's optimism. It was an optimism, however, which was contagious. He was able to exercise great personal influence over all with whom he came in contact, and he inspired his followers with hope in the most desperate situations. As a soldier he showed little special capacity: his march to Bogotá, in 1819, was certainly a fine strategical idea, and one which few generals would have attempted; probably it was a more difficult achievement than the passage of the Alps by Hannibal or Napoleon, but the class of troops at his disposal often made strategy difficult and tactics impossible. His battles often degenerated into mere tests of endurance. The accusations of personal cowardice which have been made against him are not attested by any reliable evidence. He was a man of restless and enormous energy, physically and mentally. He lived, also, a lonely life; he had no family, and few friends whom he could trust, and he died in bodily suffering and mental disappointment, deserted by almost all, scorned and slandered by the majority of those who owed everything to his exertions. The destructive part of his work was successful. He threw off the yoke of Spain, which had burdened South America for three centuries, but was unable to establish any permanent government in place of it, and South American republicanism has since been the derision of constitutional Europe. But he had to work with impossible material, and had he enjoyed the clearer and more sober political vision which San Martin possessed, and was able to use, a life which is in any case remarkable might have been extraordinary.

CHAPTER XI

Abraham Lincoln (A.D. 1809-1865)

The sixteenth president of the United States and the leader of the North in the great civil war was a self-made man, reared in the backwoods and trained in a hard school of independence and self-reliance. The Lincoln family originally came from England and settled in Massachusetts about 1638. After the War of Independence a period of great depression ensued among the old thirteen states, and many families moved westward, where the abundant game in the forests and the fish in the rivers at least supplied the bare necessities of life. In 1782 the president's grandfather settled in Kentucky. In the second year of his residence he was killed by a lurking Indian, and his youngest son was only saved from capture by the ready rifle of his elder brother. This youngest son, six years of age, by name Thomas Lincoln, was the future president's father. In 1806 he married one Nancy Hanks, of Virginia, and in their log cabin Abraham was born on 12 February, 1809. The family led a somewhat lonely life of unremitting toil and necessity; neighbours were scarce and schools there were none. As the settlement grew in size a small school was instituted in a humble log cabin, and there Abraham was able to continue the elementary teaching which he had received from his mother. When he was seven or eight years old his father resolved to move further westward. Stories reached Kentucky of the wonderful abundance of the province of Indiana. He sold his farm and cabin for twenty dollars in cash and ten barrels of whisky. The latter commodity was a recognized form of currency in days when cash was scarce. The family and its possessions were then transported by boat and pack horse to their new home, which consisted of a rough log hut in the virgin forest. The conditions of life were primitive in the extreme. The settlers depended for the most part upon their rifles, not only for the means of subsistence but also for dress materials. Rough homespun was used for shirts, but deer-skin leggings or breeches and moccasins were regularly worn. The country was able to import but little, and had not yet recovered from the consequences of the long embargo when all the American ports were closed to commerce. Tea and coffee were far too expensive to be within the reach of humble settlers, and were replaced by various herbs. Even buttons and pins were with difficulty obtainable; newspapers were hardly ever seen. Assuming that the settler could write,

and had a correspondent on the seacoast, letters might take months in reaching their destination. But occasional echoes from the outside world penetrated the backwoods, and of these the most urgent question was the extension of slavery west of the Mississippi. The boys of the Lincoln family were naturally forced to take a full share in the household labours. To learn woodcraft, the hunter's trade, to split shingles, rails, and billets of wood for building purposes became the everyday task of Abraham and his brothers, and if the life was hard, at any rate it ensured the survival of the fittest, and in this rough school Abraham acquired, not only self-reliance, but also the great physical strength which afterwards stood him in good stead.

When he was nine years old his mother died of some obscure epidemic which then devastated the district. A neighbouring family of relatives, the Sparrows, succumbed to the disease at the same time, and Thomas Lincoln was left with their child on his hands. When the funeral was over he found himself with three children, the eldest girl barely twelve years of age, who attempted to grapple with the hopeless toil of housekeeping; Abraham, at the age mentioned; and Dennis Hanks, a nephew of the Sparrows, aged eight and a half. Left to themselves, with a shiftless father, the three children must have become extremely ragged and unkempt; but there was, at any rate, no lack of food, and, what was more important to Abraham, he was able to command the use of occasional books. The *Bible*, *Æsop's Fables*, and the *Pilgrim's Progress* formed the staple of his reading. Ramsay's *Life of Washington* and other biographies came into his hands. Having no abundance of literature, and being seized with a passion for reading, he was obliged to make the most of what he had; he learned long passages by heart, and thus early was trained in the simplicity of diction and style which afterwards characterized his speeches. In the autumn of 1819 Thomas Lincoln married again. The stepmother was a widow of small means, who brought a variety of luxuries into the poverty-stricken household; she also brought three children with her by her first marriage. The amalgamated families seem to have lived in complete harmony, and the brood of young ones attended a school which had been set up a short way from the Lincoln homestead. Abraham made the most of his opportunities, and if the school could give him nothing more than the most elementary instruction, it none the less gave him hints of a greater world of knowledge which his indomitable perseverance enabled him afterwards to pursue for himself. About the age of seventeen a great impression was made upon him by a lawyer's speech which he accidentally heard in the course of a murder trial when he happened to visit the county town. He at once began extempore speechifying, arranged mock trials, and discussed local affairs with so much energy that his father was obliged to forbid speechmaking during the hours of work. In the years immediately following he began also to see something of the world. He built a flat boat and took down the river some of the market produce of the homestead. He was entrusted by the owner

of the local store with a cargo of produce for New Orleans, and on this occasion he first gained a view of the slave system in operation. A great impression was made upon him by the sight of slaves toiling in the plantations, or torn away from their families and affections in the slave market and sent up the river on the steamboats which now ran regularly upon the Mississippi. Moreover, emigrants were now streaming into Indiana, social meetings gathered for public worship, and some attempt at organized amusements became possible. In these gatherings Abraham was a conspicuous figure. He was 6 feet 4 inches in height and well-known for his physical strength and endurance. He was also notable, even thus early, for a racy wit and a large fund of anecdotes.

In the spring of 1830 the erratic Thomas Lincoln again moved house. He had heard accounts of Illinois as a fruitful and prosperous state, and therefore sold his farm, packed his family and his remaining possessions into a wagon, and once more moved westward. They settled in Macon county, and by the time that Abraham had helped to build the cabin, plough the virgin soil, and fence it in, he began to think that it was time for him to seek his independence. He was twenty-two years of age, well able to make his own living, and for a time he found casual employment with the pioneer farmers of the neighbourhood. He took a boat down to New Orleans for a small trader in the neighbourhood, and acquitted himself with such success that he was given charge of a small country store. A store in a small townshop naturally became the centre of concourse, thither gravitated the gossips and loafers of the district, and the storekeeper was obliged to be a man not only of business capacity, but of personal strength and influence in a lawless and primitive neighbourhood. Abraham became, by general consent, the peacemaker and arbitrator of the district. The result of several personal combats had made his superiority unquestioned, while his honesty and sense of justice were universally respected. He now resolved to become a candidate as representative to the Legislature, and issued an appeal to his friends and fellow citizens in 1832. Before the election came on he volunteered his services, when there was a call for forces to repel a small Indian invasion. The rising was suppressed with no great trouble, and Lincoln gained some small military experience, upon which he was afterwards able to build. Though he obtained a majority of votes in his own district his candidature was unsuccessful, but it is recorded that he began then to display that oratorical power and readiness of retort which afterwards made him so convincing a speaker. He bought a share in a store on credit, but his partner, an idle and dissolute fellow, proved the ruin of the enterprise, and Lincoln found himself upon the world without an occupation and with a heavy burden of debt. He had read a number of legal books in a desultory way, and, realizing that an opening might be found in this direction, he now borrowed books and applied himself energetically to legal study. People came to him for advice on matters connected with land,

and he gradually acquired a kind of conveyancing connection; he also undertook small cases at the local law courts. He did some surveying work and became local postmaster, which at any rate gave him the opportunity of reading all the newspapers that passed through the mail.

In 1834 he was elected to the legislature of Illinois, which sat at the capital town of Vandalia. In 1835 he was again elected to sit as a whig against the democratic party which was then in power. The great questions of the day were the extension of the franchise to people not born in the United States, and the policy of making railroads and other improvements at the public expense. Lincoln was prepared to answer both questions in the affirmative. An incident in his election campaign served to show the readiness with which he could seize an opportunity and adapt himself to his audience. A certain Forquer was to speak at Springfield on behalf of Lincoln's opponent. He had been a whig but had changed his politics from interested motives, and was to support the democrats at the time of Lincoln's candidature. As Lincoln rode into Springfield for the meeting, Forquer's house was pointed out to him, which was surmounted by a lightning conductor, a considerable novelty at that time. Forquer spoke before Lincoln at the meeting, and made an unjustified and ungenerous personal attack upon his appearance and manners. Lincoln began by saying: "I am not so young in years as I am in the tricks of the politicians' trade, but, live long or die young, I would rather die now than, like that gentleman, change my politics and with the change receive an office worth 3000 dollars a year, and then feel obliged to erect a lightning conductor over my house to protect a guilty conscience from an offended God". The effect upon the audience was instantaneous, and the unfortunate Forquer never heard the last of his lightning conductor. In the course of this session Lincoln definitely opposed for the first time a further extension of the system of slavery. Illinois and Indiana were forced to consider the question by the pro-slavery attitude of their neighbours and rivals in commerce, Kentucky and Missouri. Even then a few bold spirits had begun to inveigh against slavery, and the object of the slave-holding states was to discourage anti-slavery agitation elsewhere. Lincoln and a friend named Stone protested against legislation favourable to slavery, in a document asserting that the institution "was founded on injustice and bad policy", a bold and even dangerous assertion for anyone to make in those times.

In 1837 Lincoln settled in Springfield and established himself in the practice of the law. He took a prominent part in the presidential election campaign of 1840, and in that year he married a Miss Mary Todd. He wrote occasional newspaper articles, gave lectures, extended his legal business, and his general popularity induced him to think that he might reasonably come forward as a candidate for Congress. During this year, however, he abandoned his own chance in order to secure the election of a friend. Not until 1846 was he nomi-

nated for Congress. He was elected by a large majority and found no lack of material for his speeches. During the preceding winter the new state of Texas had been admitted to the union. Texas had seceded from Mexico and had eventually secured its independence, though Mexico still claimed suzerainty over it. The admission of Texas to the Federal union was the work of the Southern States, who were anxious to add to their number in view of the increasing population and prosperity of the North. It was thus a move intended to support the slave-owning interests, and as such was vigorously opposed by the whigs and by Lincoln in particular. During the session Lincoln introduced a bill to abolish slavery in the district of Columbia. The sight of slave gangs passing through Washington, the very capital of the country, on their way to the south, stirred his heart with indignation. But though his bill was moderately framed, and fully respected the property rights of slaveholders, it never had a chance. In 1839 Lincoln's term of office came to an end and he returned to Springfield. He then devoted his attention to his legal practice and gained a great reputation for immutable honesty and fair dealing, declining to touch cases in which doubtful principles were involved and undertaking several lawsuits on behalf of negroes, one at least of which became famous as involving certain principles which Lincoln was afterwards obliged to uphold, in particular the question as to the status of slaves who happened to have been transported or transferred to free states.

During the next few years the calm which preceded the storm prevailed, and not until 1854 did the slave question again become a burning topic. In that year the new states of Kansas and Nebraska were anxious for admission to the union. By the so-called Missouri compromise, enacted in 1820, slavery was prohibited beyond the northern boundary of that state, and therefore within the territory of the two applicants for admission. A bill was introduced in the Senate which proposed to leave the question to be settled by the voters of the districts concerned, and this practically amounted to a repeal of the Missouri compromise. The bill was eventually passed in 1854, and aroused the bitterest excitement in the North. There was one obvious method of making its provisions null and void, namely, for its opponents to occupy the territory in the newly admitted states, and, as settlers, to outvote the pro-slavery party. Hence there was a great rush to take possession of the new territory, both from the North and from the South. The promoter of the bill had been a certain Douglas, a senator of Illinois, who was accused of introducing it from interested motives, as he hoped to secure the support of the Southern States in the election for the next presidency. Douglas, dismayed at the explosion of wrath which his action had produced, hastened back to Illinois with the object of persuading his constituents that his action had been justified. At Springfield a great meeting was held, and Lincoln was requested, by universal consent, to answer the arguments of Douglas. No report of his speech remains, but it made a tremendous sensation, and Douglas

and his party were completely crushed. One saying in the course of it has been preserved. Douglas had been ingeniously asserting that, by every principle of popular sovereignty, the inhabitants of a state should have the right to introduce slavery if they wished to do so, and that the opponents of his bill were virtually insulting the voters of Kansas and Nebraska by asserting that they were not able to govern themselves. Lincoln said, in reply to this argument: "I admit that the emigrant of Kansas and Nebraska is able to govern himself, but I deny his right to govern any other person without that person's consent". Here Lincoln struck at the root of the whole matter. Douglas and his party were unable to recognize that the negro possessed any greater claims upon humanity than a horse or a cow. Lincoln insisted that such an attitude was wrong and unjust.

Meanwhile the position of affairs in Kansas had become almost desperate. The slavery champions who trooped over the borders did not come as actual settlers, and had no intention of doing any work, but were prepared by any means of lawlessness to terrorize their opponents and manipulate the elections. Secret societies were formed for the purpose of driving free state men out of the country. Raids were made, farms were devastated, settlers were killed, and women and children were insulted. However, the settled anti-slavery population seemed likely to win the day; slaves crossed the border, and were easily able to hide, as pursuit was hopeless in so unsettled a country. Meanwhile the time was approaching when the constitution of Kansas as a member of the Federal Government must be settled. The free state men organized a Government, framed a constitution excluding slavery, and elected a governor. Meanwhile the regular territorial legislature appointed by the president was existing side by side with their own; in short, Kansas presented in miniature the main features of the problem which was afterwards to rend the union in twain, a situation difficult enough to puzzle wiser heads even than Lincoln's. In a speech delivered in 1854 he said:

If all earthly power were given to me I should not know what to do with it as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves and send them to their native land, Liberia, but if they were all landed there in a day they would all perish in the next ten days, and there is not surplus shipping or surplus money enough to carry them there in many times ten days. What is to happen then?

So much, at any rate, was obvious, that the country could not live in peace half-slave and half-free, and Lincoln was therefore determined to confine the institution to those states in which it already existed. Probably he considered that it would die out of itself in course of time. Meanwhile his policy was to move in such a direction as to prepare the ground for liberation without violence and without war when the time should come. He thus became the champion of that party known as the Free Soil Party.

In 1856 a mass meeting was called in Illinois, of those opposed

to the institution of slavery, which might be regarded as the foundation of the later republican party. Lincoln made a masterly speech, which entirely united the many discordant elements of which the party was composed, and established them upon the common ground that slavery must not be permitted to extend into territories previously free. Meanwhile the mass meetings of the settlers of Kansas were unable to secure the existence of their free constitution. Their legislature was dispersed by the orders of the president, and it became obvious that slavery was to be forced upon this state. In 1858 Lincoln entered upon a contest for the senatorship with Douglas, whose bill had been the cause of the whole slave uproar. The matter had been further complicated by the decision of the supreme court in the case of a negro who sued for his freedom on the ground that his owner had carried him north of the Missouri line, and that he had thus become free by the operation of the law. The chief-justice decided against him, and thus virtually stated that by the constitution slavery existed in all territories and that Congress was unable to prevent it. Slavery, in short, was national, and freedom was local. This decision was obviously destructive of Douglas's theory of popular sovereignty. It enforced slavery, or the toleration thereof, upon every state within the union before the inhabitants had any opportunity of voting upon it. Lincoln and Douglas debated the whole question at public meetings which attracted the greatest attention and brought enormous crowds of people together. The debates gave Lincoln a tremendous reputation, and when he visited Kansas for the first time, in the winter of 1859, he was received with unbounded enthusiasm. In 1860 he delivered a speech in the Plymouth church in Brooklyn, of which a member of the audience has given the following description:—

When Lincoln rose to speak, I was greatly disappointed. He was tall, tall—oh, how tall, and so angular and awkward that I had, for an instant, a feeling of pity for so ungainly a man. His clothes were black and ill-fitting, badly wrinkled, as if they had been jammed carelessly into a small trunk. His bushy head, with the stiff black hair thrown back, was balanced on a long and lean headstalk, and when he raised his hands in an opening gesture I noticed that they were very large. He began in a low tone of voice, as if he were used to speaking outdoors, and was afraid of speaking too loud. He said "Mr. Cheerman" instead of "Mr. Chairman", and employed many other words with an oldfashioned pronunciation. I said to myself: "Old fellow, you won't do; it's all very well for the wild West, but this will never go down in New York." But pretty soon he began to get into his subject; he straightened up, made regular and graceful gestures; his face lighted as with an inward fire; the whole man was transfigured. I forgot his clothes, his personal appearance, and his individual peculiarities. Presently, forgetting myself, I was on my feet with the rest, yelling like a wild Indian, cheering this wonderful man. In the close parts of his argument you could hear the gentle sizzling of the gas-burners. When he reached a climax, the thunders of applause were terrific. It was a great speech. When I came out of the hall, my face glowing with excitement and my frame all a-quiver, a friend, with his eyes aglow, asked me what I thought of Abe Lincoln, the rail-



(top)

A. Lincoln.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

From a lithograph after the photograph by Brady

splitter. I said: "He's the greatest man since St. Paul." And I think so yet!

In June, 1860, Lincoln was nominated as the republican candidate for the presidency and was duly elected in the course of the year. The election was fought upon the question of slavery; within the southern states there were some 4,000,000 slaves, and these states were concerned to secure that their negroes should be sacred as property in every state of the union, and that fugitives should nowhere find shelter upon American soil. The republican party was determined to prevent the extension of slave rights in any direction whatever, and, in Lincoln's words, had been pledged to remember that "all men are endowed, by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness". Lincoln took up office with a full consciousness of the problem before him and the heavy responsibility which he would have to bear. The South had repeatedly declared that his election would be sufficient excuse for secession from the union. The new president was overwhelmed with suggestions and with advice upon the problems before him, and was, moreover, persistently pestered with applicants for office. The maxim enforced by the doctrine: "to the victors belong the spoils", had been pursued by American presidents from Andrew Jackson downwards, and a new election generally meant a clean sweep of existing office holders and a grand distribution of patronage by the party which came into power. Lincoln declined to follow this principle in its entirety: if he saw a competent civil servant his natural inclination was to keep him in office, provided that he could discharge his duty efficiently. Some loss of popularity to himself was often the consequence.

Meanwhile the members of the past cabinet who were in sympathy with the Southern States foresaw, as did most people, that war would be the probable result, and were doing what they could to help the Southern cause. The secretary for war, who was a Southerner, scattered the army over the Southern States with the object of making mobilization as difficult as possible. Similarly the navy was widely dispersed, and the secretary to the treasury involved the finances in difficulties. The Southern senators and representatives remained in office until the last moment in Washington, drawing their pay and professing to support the Government which they were plotting to overthrow. At the end of 1860, by the time Lincoln was ready to enter upon his presidency, seven states had declared themselves as secessionists, and though they did not at first become a separate confederacy, they declared their independence of the republic. On 4 February, 1861, their representatives assembled in Alabama, and formed a confederacy with Jefferson Davis as provisional president. The existing president of the United States was a feeble character, entirely in the hands of the rebels, and Lincoln was obliged to watch these revolutionary proceedings in immobility until the day came when he ceased to be a private citizen. This event occurred on 11 February,

European History

1861, when Lincoln left Springfield for Washington. His progress to the capital was marked by an extraordinary outburst of enthusiasm, and his first inaugural address was a striking and diplomatic success. The North did not begin the war until no other issue seemed possible. Every attempt was made to conciliate the Southerners, and this pacific frame of mind was strongly reinforced by commercial considerations. The great manufacturing states of the north were large buyers of the cotton grown in the south, and the outbreak of the war would lose them their best and most profitable customers. Lincoln was quite willing to observe the *status quo* if any means of accommodation could be found, and urged upon the South that his election did not mean an instantaneous attack upon slavery as such. "I have no purpose," he said, "directly or indirectly, of interfering with the institution of slavery in the states in which it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so. Those who nominated and elected me did so with the full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them." Similarly, Lincoln was quite ready to accept the doctrine that a slave who escapes from a slave state to a free state is not thereby made free. He outlined his policy by asserting that no state could lawfully leave the union under the terms of the constitution, and that acts of violence against the authority of the United States became acts of insurrection and revolution according to circumstances; that, in accordance with the terms of his oath, he was determined to see that the laws of the United States were faithfully executed throughout the republic, and that there would be no bloodshed or violence unless war was forced on the national authority. While the North thus hoped for the best the South had long ago determined upon war, and Lincoln's object was to lay upon them the responsibility of beginning hostilities. On 9 March the southern Congress passed a bill for the organization of an army; they also sent commissioners to Washington to negotiate a treaty with the United States Government. Lincoln declined to see or hear them, and made no sign that he was even aware of the existence of their revolutionary Government. Eventually, on 12 April, the rebels opened fire upon Fort Sumter, in Charlestown harbour, which was held for the North by a small garrison. The fort was speedily reduced by a cannonade, and any hesitation that the North had shown at once disappeared. The president issued a call for 75,000 troops, which was received with great enthusiasm, and urged upon all citizens to defend the union. Five hundred thousand men offered themselves as volunteers; vast sums of money were subscribed for the purpose of the struggle. There was a great rush of applicants ready to serve the republic in any capacity, and the President issued a proclamation declaring the Southern ports in state of blockade.

The South was in a much better state of preparation. Virginia joined the Confederacy, and Richmond, the capital of that state, became the Federal capital. Harper's Ferry, in Virginia, an important strategical point in the north of the state, with large supplies of munition

UNITED STATES

CIVIL WAR 1861-65

Union States Confederate States

Battlefields

English Miles

American Miles

Sea Miles

100

95

90

85

80

75

70

65

60

55

50

45

40

35

30

25

20

15

10

5

0

40

45

50

55

60

65

70

75

80

85

90

95

100

105

110

115

120

125

130

135

140

145

150

155

160

165

170

175

180

185

190

195

200

205

210

215

220

225

230

235

240

245

250

255

260

265

270

275

280

285

290

295

300

305

310

315

320

325

330

335

340

345

350

355

360

365

370

375

380

385

390

395

400

405

410

415

420

425

430

435

440

445

450

455

460

465

470

475

480

485

490

495

500

505

510

515

520

525

530

535

540

545

550

555

560

565

570

575

580

585

590

595

600

605

610

615

620

625

630

635

640

645

650

655

660

665

670

675

680

685

690

695

700

705

710

715

720

725

730

735

740

745

750

755

760

765

770

775

780

785

790

795

800

805

810

815

820

825

830

835

840

845

850

855

860

865

870

875

880

885

890

895

900

905

910

915

920

925

930

935

940

945

950

955

960

965

970

975

980

985

990

995

1000

1005

1010

1015

1020

1025

1030

1035

1040

1045

1050

1055

1060

1065

1070

1075

1080

1085

1090

1095

1100

1105

1110

1115

1120

1125

1130

1135

1140

1145

1150

1155

1160

1165

1170

1175

1180

1185

1190

1195

1200

1205

1210

1215

1220

1225

1230

1235

1240

1245

1250

1255

1260

1265

1270

1275

1280

1285

1290

1295

1300

1305

1310

1315

1320

1325

1330

1335

1340

1345

1350

1355

1360

1365

1370

1375

1380

1385

1390

1395

1400

1405

1410

1415

1420

1425

1430

1435

1440

1445

1450

1455

1460

1465

1470

1475

1480

1485

1490

1495

1500

1505

1510

1515

1520

1525

1530


of war, was seized by the rebels. At the outset the disparity in numbers between the contending forces was very great. The population of the Southern States was 9,000,000, of whom more than one-third were slaves while the Northern States counted some 22,000,000. The slaves, however, were valuable to the Southerners for camp and entrenchment work, and were no doubt, in many cases, entirely loyal to their old masters. Though it is true that the institution as such was abhorrent to the general sense of humanity, on the other hand, in very many individual cases the slaves were well treated, were bound to the families whom they served by ties of affection, and would have regarded immediate freedom as a curse rather than a blessing. Eventually the Northerners declined to surrender rebel slaves who came into their lines, and actually termed them contraband of war. The result was a new opening for fugitive slaves who were dissatisfied with their lot. On 19 July took place the battle of Bull Run, which ended in a great defeat for the Northerners, a result chiefly due to inexperience and bad management. The effect did not greatly weaken the patriotism of the North; men and money were at once forthcoming for a further effort. General M'Clellan laid the foundations of a great reputation, which he afterwards failed to justify, by driving the rebels out of western Virginia, which was afterwards reorganized as a new state within the union. Another question of considerable importance was the attitude of foreign powers. The rebels had no navy, and though the Northerners had some ships they were too small at the moment to make a blockade of the Southern ports effective. Almost immediately after the outbreak of hostilities, Britain and France recognized the rebel Government as a belligerent power with the rights of an independent nation, much to the disappointment of Lincoln and the Northerners. The question became more acute when two rebel envoys were captured upon a British ship by a United States man-of-war, and were carried to Boston. The British Government lodged a demand that as they had been taken from under the British flag they should be surrendered. The rebels were delighted with the incident, expecting that war between Britain and the United States would be the result. The North were determined that the envoys should not be surrendered, and loudly congratulated the captain who had captured them. Lincoln, however, after carefully examining the case, was convinced that the seizure was illegal and that the envoys must be given up. In spite of the wrath and opposition of the Northerners he carried his point. After some time people began to recognize that he had acted wisely. Whatever the justice of the case might have been, the United States certainly could not undertake a European war in addition to their domestic troubles. Meanwhile, to M'Clellan had been assigned the command of the army of the Potomac, which numbered some 20,000 men. The command of the west was given to Fremont, who made St. Louis his headquarters. The state of Missouri was in great disorder, was overrun with rebels, and seemed likely to leave the union. Fremont placed it under martial law and declared that the property of all rebels would

be confiscated and their slaves freed by his proclamation. Lincoln was obliged to modify this proclamation, and was anxious as far as possible to soothe the feelings of the border states, and retain their adherence to the union. This he was willing to do at the expense of his own feelings with regard to the emancipation of the slaves. Probably he thought that some measure of gradual emancipation would best meet the case. He was, at any rate, convinced of the fact that the two halves of the country could not live together as long as they were divided by this great question.

Throughout 1862 the progress of the war dragged along. M'Clellan displayed great dilatoriness and reluctance, while the rebels, under General Lee, secured some important successes. They crossed the Potomac and invaded Maryland, and upon their defeat Lincoln issued his famous proclamation declaring the freedom of the slaves:

I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within the said designated states and parts of states are and henceforth shall be free, and that the executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of the said persons.

This proclamation brought congratulations from many parts of the Continent and especially from Britain. In the latter country public opinion, which had at first been inclined to support the Southerners, began to turn in favour of the North. Lincoln's general plan was to blockade the ports of the rebel states, to occupy the border states with a sufficient force to prevent invasion, and to gain command of the Mississippi River, by which means the rebel confederacy would be cut in half and the west would recover its natural outlet to the sea. In supreme command was general M'Clellan, who had 150,000 men ready for duty in the autumn of 1861. General Grant was at this time rising into prominence, and defeated the rebels in several small engagements. By the end of May, 1862, the states of Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee had been recovered to the union, and in the end of the previous year Admiral Farragut succeeded in running past the forts which guarded New Orleans, and opening the Mississippi as far as Vicksburg. In this direction, therefore, progress could be chronicled. M'Clellan, however, remained in total inactivity before Washington with the large and costly army of the Potomac. He made constant excuses for delay, demanding additional reinforcements and munitions of war. Various plans were suggested to him, which he declined to undertake, and the much inferior force of rebels was enabled to operate almost undisturbed. His failure to co-operate with General Pope, who was opposed by the rebel forces under Jackson and Lee, began to shake public confidence in his ability. His victory over Lee at the battle of Antietam was incomplete, owing to his failure to follow up his success. Lincoln has been much criticized for his delay in taking the step to which he was ultimately driven in removing M'Clellan from his command.



PRESIDENT LINCOLN SIGNING THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

After the painting by F. B. Carpenter in the House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington

But he was obliged to act with the support of public opinion. Many subordinate officers in the army were warm admirers of M'Clellan, nor could the discipline of the Northern army be compared with that of European forces. A general unsupported by the opinion of the rank and file would have been as helpless as a general who did nothing. As soon as Lincoln felt that the proper moment had arrived he placed general Burnside in command of the army of the Potomac. Burnside attacked the rebels at Fredericksburg on 15 December, 1862, and was defeated with great slaughter. The rebels had obtained a footing in Kentucky, and still retained their hold on Vicksburg, the key to the Mississippi. These disasters naturally aroused much disappointment in the Northern States. One party urged Lincoln to make another change in the command, while another party was no less importunate for the conclusion of peace upon almost any terms. Another crushing disaster followed with the battle of Chancellorsville. A law of conscription became necessary, and ex-slaves were equipped with United States uniforms, a measure which aroused great opposition. A loan was raised to the extent of nine hundred millions of dollars, and one hundred million dollars were issued in paper money to meet the immediate expenses of the Government.

The first real gleam of light appeared for the North in July, 1863, when General Grant succeeded in reducing the city of Vicksburg, which surrendered with a large force and great quantities of military stores. This victory opened the entire course of the Mississippi to Federal traffic. Then came the battle of Gettysburg, as a result of Lee's attempt to carry the war into the Northern States. The casualties in this fight amounted to 46,000 men, and both sides suffered almost equal losses. Lee, one of the finest characters and greatest generals that the war produced, was out-maneuvred and forced to retire. He made a brilliant retreat and succeeded in escaping into Virginia. Few commanders lost so little glory by defeat, and only Lee's original genius and magnetic personality enabled the South to protract a struggle which, for economic reasons, was hopeless. But the general sense of relief was very great, and on 15 July, 1863, the president proclaimed a day of national thanksgiving, which became a permanent national festival upon 3 October, and has since been known as Thanksgiving Day. In November the battlefield of Gettysburg was consecrated as the burial place of the dead who had fallen upon that historic spot. Addresses were delivered in the course of the ceremony, and included a touching oration from the president. His anxieties had been increased by a series of riots in New York, which had broken out as a result of opposition to the conscription law, especially among certain sections of the foreign population, whose sense of patriotism was not sufficiently strong to lead them to fight for their adopted country. The disorder could not be suppressed until troops had been called in from Pennsylvania. In 1864 Lincoln's presidency was to come to an end. He made no secret that he was ready to take office for a second term, not from any sense of personal ambition,

but because he wished to finish the war; as he said to an intimate friend, he thought "it was not wise to swap horses while crossing the stream". In the winter of 1863 General Grant was appointed as lieutenant-general. His series of victories in the west had gained him full public confidence. Grant was not only a fine general but also a modest and quiet character, unwilling to advance his position by self-seeking and loyally devoted to his profession. His place on the Mississippi was taken by General Sherman, and from this time onwards the armies of the west and those of the east were able to act in concert. Hitherto the jealousy existing between their commanders had prevented them from operating concurrently against the enemy, who was able to move upon interior lines, engaging either of the armies as suited his purpose. In May, 1864, the re-organized forces opened the campaign. The battles of the Wilderness formed a series of long and stubbornly contested encounters which gradually drove the rebels back upon Richmond, while Sherman on his side pressed forward along the western slope of the Alleghanies and invested Atlanta, eventually defeating the rebel forces under Hood with such decision that their cohesion as an army was gone.

Some opposition, even within the republican party, was offered to Lincoln's renomination, by the so-called radical party, whose mouthpiece was Horace Greely of the *New York Tribune*. Their dissatisfaction was chiefly expressed with the pronouncement relating to slavery and the prosecution of the war, in both of which respects they desired to see a more energetic policy pursued. Attempts were made to discover an even more pronounced anti-slavery candidate than Lincoln; but when the convention met for the purpose of nomination no other candidate was forthcoming, and hardly a dissenting vote opposed Lincoln's nomination. The democratic party nominated General M'Clellan as the leader of a policy declaring for peace and an early termination of the war. The election resulted in an overwhelming majority for Lincoln; only three states voted against him. Meanwhile unofficial communications were coming in from the rebel side for the purpose of discovering whether there was any possibility of peace. Lincoln, however, declined to recognize the rebels as a belligerent state, nor would he hear of any armistice during the progress of negotiations, in the course of which Sherman began his great march from Atlanta to the sea, which compelled the rebels to abandon Charleston and broke the spirit of the secessionist resistance. The scattered remnants of the rebel forces concentrated round Lee for a final effort at resistance before their capital. Grant and Sheridan succeeded in drawing a line completely round the enemy and cutting off supplies. On 3 April, 1865, Richmond surrendered, and Lincoln was able to enter the capital of the rebel confederacy. On 9 April the army of northern Virginia surrendered and the war was practically over. Excitement in the North was indescribable, and vast multitudes collected before the White House in Washington

to listen to a political speech from the president. It was the last speech he ever made. On the night of 14 April he visited the theatre with his wife, General Grant, and a few personal friends. A certain Wilkes Booth, an actor, who seems to have been obsessed by an insane idea that Lincoln was a tyrant whose death was desirable, succeeded in making his way into the box occupied by the president and shot him in the head from behind. The wound was mortal and Lincoln died early the next morning. Other attempts were made at the same time upon other members of the Government but without success, and the conspirators in course of time were arrested and put to death.

Lincoln lived a simple, unostentatious life, whether as president or as a private citizen. Of his three sons two survived him. He was not only an orator but also a leader of men; he had the sound common sense which can judge of men's capacities, and a belief in his own opinions which enabled him to support his appointments. He had also an infinite amount of patience and forbearance as long as he thought there was any prospect of attaining the end which he had in view. His early backwood experiences had provided him with a large fund of homely anecdotes and pithy aphorisms, which, in American fashion, he was accustomed to apply to the circumstances of any case laid before him. Those who did not know him sometimes regarded his attitude as undignified or trifling, but no one could better support the dignities of his office when occasion required. He often seemed slow to move, but, having definitely considered his policy and determined the next step to be taken, no remonstrances or counter arguments could turn him aside. At the same time he was by no means obstinate. One of his schemes was the payment of a large sum of money to the rebel states as the price for the abolition of slavery within their borders. This was submitted to the cabinet in February, 1865, after peace negotiations had begun. He was much surprised to discover that the members were unanimously opposed to any proposal of the sort, and in view of the general opposition he readily abandoned his plan. He was always open to petitioners and office seekers, of whom he saw an enormous number, and this while he was obliged to consider the general policy to be followed upon the slave question, the general plan of campaign during the war, and an infinity of minor details which concerned each individual command. He was buried near his town of Springfield, for which purpose the body was carried a distance of nearly 2000 miles. Extraordinary scenes of sorrow and sympathy were seen throughout the journey, while the messages of condolence from every civilized country showed that his reputation abroad was as high as his popularity at home. The secret of his influence is to be found, not only in his firm common sense and penetrating insight which went to the heart of a problem, but also in his strong belief in the moral government of the world and his desire to use his power for moral purposes. No better illustration can be

found than his words as reported to a friend just before the election of November, 1860, upon the slave question:

I know there is a God and that he hates injustice and slavery. I see the storm coming, and I know his hand is in it. If he has a place and work for me, and I think he has, I believe I am ready. I am nothing, but truth is everything. I know that I am right because I know that liberty is right, for Christ teaches it, and Christ is God. I have told them that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and Christ and reason say the same thing; and they will find it so. Douglas doesn't care whether slavery is voted up or voted down, but God cares, and humanity cares, and I care; and with God's help I shall not fail. I may not see the end, but it will come and I shall be vindicated; and these men will find that they have not read their Bibles aright.

CHAPTER XII

Bismarck (A.D. 1815-1898)

The German Cromwell, the creator and unifier of modern Germany, was born a short time before the battle of Waterloo, on 1 April, 1815. His family belonged to the lesser nobility of Brandenburg, and had for generations distinguished themselves in the service of Prussia. Lieutenant Von Katte, for instance, whose youthful attachment to Frederick the Great became the cause of his death, was connected with Bismarck's family; so also was Field-Marshal Von Derfflinger, the well-known conqueror of the Swedes, and family traditions thus pointed to war and to a life of farming and hunting in times of peace. Bismarck himself seemed quite prepared to walk in the steps of his ancestors. At the university he was chiefly remarkable for the disorderly character of his behaviour, though at the same time he passed his state examination and also became a friend of the historian Motley, facts which show that his energies were not entirely devoted to amusement. He then performed his year's military service, and occupied himself with the management of the family estates in Pomerania, which had been greatly encumbered through his father's extravagance. He became a fully competent farmer and was also well known throughout the district for the extravagance and turbulence of his character. He was a deep drinker and a hard rider, possessed of an exuberant fund of spirits and superfluous energy which he expended in the wildest pranks. On the death of his father in 1845 he obtained a definite share of the family property. In 1847 he married the daughter of a Pomeranian squire, and was elected as deputy for his district, which he represented at Berlin when Frederick William IV summoned a representative assembly from the eight provincial Diets of the monarchy. Bismarck then made his entry upon the political stage. He was thirty-two years of age, a tall and imposing figure with fair hair and beard, blue-eyed, and a striking contrast to the well-known pictures of the famous chancellor in his old age.

Bismarck found no constitutional government worth mentioning or represented by the assembly of which he was a member. Frederick William IV had come to the throne in 1840 with much talk concerning the unity of Germany and the freedom of Prussia, but his subjects soon realized that these fine phrases meant nothing. Religious liberty he was prepared to grant, but for political freedom he deemed his people unsuited, and while the movement that had begun at Jena, and

proceeded in 1813, was silently working for the production of the shock which was to open his eyes, he was himself expending his time and thought upon the restoration of Cologne cathedral, the conversion of the Chinese, and the establishment of Protestantism in Jerusalem. The freedom of the press which he permitted had, however, produced a crop of pamphlets and lampoons which showed him that something must be done. He visited England and was impressed with the advantages of constitutional government, while Queen Victoria and Prince Albert had also poured useful advice into his ears. An attempt had been made to assassinate him; the only councillors to whom he would listen suggested the advisability of concession, and he therefore reluctantly resolved that the eight provincial assemblies of the realm should meet as one collective Diet, and in this assembly Herr Von Bismarck took his seat on 11 April, 1847. The impression made by the king's speech could hardly have rejoiced the hearts of the constitutional party, who were informed that a strong absolutism was necessary for the maintenance of Prussia, and that if they misbehaved themselves or forgot his sovereign rights they would not be likely to assemble again for a long time to come. So much was entirely in consonance with the opinion of Bismarck. The military nobility of Prussia were ever most warmly attached to the person of the sovereign. Bismarck shared this feeling to the uttermost, disapproved of the concessions which had been extorted from the king, and first opened his mouth in the assembly, after it had sat for a month, to give expression to these feelings. The natural result was opposition, and such speeches as he was able to make seem to have been punctuated with the reporter's terms: "Uproar", "Commotion", "Sensation". After some three months of squabbling the Diet was dismissed. Nothing had been done except to accentuate the opposition between the crown and the people. It was shortly after this date that Bismarck married and went to Italy for a tour. Frederick William IV followed his example and happened to meet Bismarck at Venice. The king invited him to dinner, and was delighted to find a politician whose views were so entirely in harmony with his own.

Great was the shock of the revolution of 1848 in France, and the proclamation of the republic; every capital in Europe was immediately stirred to action. Alarmed by the progress of the revolution throughout Europe, the king promised reform. The fall of Metternich at Vienna made some such measure inevitable. On 18 March the king was cheered before the castle by the crowd, but the mob leaders turned a peaceful assembly into an uproar, and the troops spent the afternoon and the evening in clearing the streets. After much bloodshed the king's forces were completely victorious, but his own nervousness and vacillation were increased by the talk of prominent citizens who made their way into the castle, and the next day the king withdrew all opposition. The popular party regarded the retreat of the troops as a victory for themselves, but the king's concessions gained him rather their scorn than their gratitude. These events caused Bismarck pro-

found grief. With popular sovereignty he had not the smallest sympathy, and any sympathy that he might have had was at once alienated by the sight of slovenly citizen troops upon guard, and by the sound of amnestied Jews and jailbirds pouring forth streams of platitudes concerning constitutional freedom upon every platform. Bismarck resolved to do what he could for the monarchy, and resumed his seat in the united Diet which met upon 2 April, 1848, to convoke the National Assembly with the object of forming a constitution upon the basis of universal suffrage. In the National Assembly he did not sit, and thus escaped the six months of continual wrangling which proceeded at Frankfort-on-Main. Constitution-mongers reigned supreme, ministry followed ministry, mob rule became paramount in Berlin, and at length the king summoned up courage to dismiss the Assembly altogether. At the same time he issued a constitution on his own responsibility in 1849, which was of a very liberal character, and was to be revised by the second chamber of a Parliament summoned upon the principle of universal suffrage.

Meanwhile Bismarck was doing his utmost to form a conservative party, and contributed extensively to a newly founded paper, the *Kreuz Zeitung*. He had frequent conferences with the king, who eventually gained from him a promise of support even in the introduction of those reforms which Bismarck especially disliked. In the course of the second Prussian Parliament he made his famous speech upon the revision of the constitution, in which he answered those who attempted to draw analogies from British constitutionalism:

Appeals to England are our misfortune; give us everything English which we have not got; give us the English fear of God, English respect for law, the complete English constitution; but give us also English wealth, English public spirit, and especially an English House of Commons; then I will say that you can rule us in the English fashion. In the course of our political education we often hear quoted to us the proverb, that if we want to learn to swim, we must go into the water; that may be true, but I do not understand why a man who wishes to learn to swim is to jump in exactly at the place where the water is deepest, because some practised swimmer is moving about there in safety. The class which in England engages in politics does not exist with us, the class of the well-to-do and therefore conservative gentlemen, whose whole education is arranged with a view to their becoming English statesmen and whose whole aim in life is to interest themselves in the common weal. With us the educated are, with few exceptions, so wrapped up in their private affairs, that we run the risk of seeing in the future many of the places here occupied by men, who, having nothing to leave at home, come here with the intention of improving their position.

The best compromise Bismarck could see was a strong upper chamber and an efficient army, which he regarded as the salvation of Prussia. Democracy he considered a hopelessly incompetent government, and the ballot box as little better than a game of roulette.

These were matters that concerned Prussia alone, but meanwhile

a deputation had offered the king of Prussia the imperial German crown. The first step towards German unity began in 1836, after the formation of the Zollverein, or customs union, by which year almost all the states of the German federation except Austria had agreed to adopt free trade among themselves. The stimulus thus given to internal commerce taught the people to realize the possibility of German union, and taught them also to look to Prussia as the centre of unity and as the future leader. The Frankfort Assembly of 1848 also attempted to give expression to these desires, but it was impossible to arrange a national constitution which would include all the German states. The unreasonable demands of Austria roused the opposition of the majority, who voted that Austria and her non-German territories should be excluded from the federation, and that the imperial crown should be offered to Prussia. Frederick William, however, declined the honour. If he could recognize the voice of the people he could not hear the voice of his fellow princes, and insisted that he could not take such a step without their assent. At the same time his refusal was only conditional, and he began to take steps for procuring the concurrence of his fellow princes. After the dissolution of the chamber, Prussia, Saxony, and Hanover formed a federation known as the Tri-Regal Alliance, with the object of forming a restricted union of all German states except Austria. Austria, meanwhile, was fully occupied by the struggle with Hungary under Kossuth, and when the Hungarian patriots had been crushed, with the help of Russia, Austria revived the old federal Diet which had been dissolved upon the meeting of the constituent assembly, and took active measures to re-establish her position. The result very nearly ended in war; but after two years of chaffering Prussia was obliged to abandon her project of German reorganization. What Bismarck had gained was an unswerving reputation for loyalty to the crown and for hardshell conservatism. As a debater he showed dexterity and resource rather than eloquence. But the impetuosity of his attack, the combination of sound common sense with fervent enthusiasm, marked him out as a future leader.

Bismarck joined the Diet of Frankfort in May, 1851. He had a considerable contempt for his fellow politicians, and spoke of them as a drowsy and insipid set of courtiers, troubling themselves with nothing but the most insignificant trifles. At this time, however, he came into closer contact with the prince of Prussia, and then was laid the foundation of that mutual respect and attachment which became the basis of after achievement. Bismarck had been raised to the rank of a privy councillor of legation, and was now acting as secretary to the member representing Prussia at the Frankfort Diet. His letters and dispatches during this period provide a racy description of the petty intrigues which then occupied the stage, and display, not only energy and ambition, common sense and breadth of view, but also an extraordinary power of observing events in their true perspective and collecting news wherever information was important. Bismarck's hope at Frankfort was to avoid any subservience to Austria, and to secure

an equal position and influence for the kingdom which he represented. The difficulty was that Austria could control a considerably larger number of votes than Prussia, and even at this time Bismarck fully realized that the contradiction could only be solved by an appeal to war. The Federal constitution gave Austria the presiding seat in the Diet, and the competency of the chairman was continually challenged by Prussia. While Bismarck was able to champion the rights of his own state and of similar states upon matters of form, a majority of them were inclined to yield to Austria upon matters in which Prussian interests were affected. The divergency between the powers became more obvious after December, 1851; when Louis Napoleon, the president of the French republic, carried out his *coup d'état*, both Prussia and Austria were prepared to recognize the Government at Paris, on condition that the new sovereign would keep the peace and observe existing treaties. But when the Crimean war broke out, the attitude of Prussia and Austria upon this question showed wide divergence. No less incompatibility of temper was aroused by the question of the North Sea fleet, an insignificant squadron raised in 1848 by the German sovereigns in common. Questions of its control, its maintenance, and its use caused a constant succession of squabbles which occupied the attention of the Diet for nearly a year.

In 1852 Bismarck went to Vienna for a few weeks to act as the substitute of the regular ambassador, Count Arnim. He there had an interview with the emperor of Austria, Francis Joseph. The emperor desired a customs union which would include the whole of the Germanic kingdoms. Bismarck insisted that Austria must either modify her peculiar system of tariffs or remain outside the union. He was prepared to reconstruct the "Zollverein" under Prussia, and then to conclude a treaty with Austria which might allow her to re-enter the union by degrees. At a tariff meeting held in June, 1851, Austria had secured the support of every state within the Zollverein with the exception of Prussia, which was therefore obliged, in the same year, to join the free trade union which Hanover had formed with Oldenburg and Lippe. This move cut off the Austrian Zollverein from the sea, and deprived her of the advantages which the previous Prussian union had afforded. In 1853 Austria was therefore obliged to conclude a commercial treaty with Prussia, and to leave the smaller states to make the best terms they could for themselves. Nothing remained for them except to join Prussia, and thus the Zollverein was renewed, and was to last until 1865. In 1855 Bismarck paid a visit to Paris and made the acquaintance of Louis Napoleon. Prussia had maintained a strict neutrality during the Crimean war. Bismarck, looking to the future, felt that sooner or later the Russian neutrality would become of immense advantage to Prussia, and saw no reason why his country should be involved in an expensive war from which she could derive no possible benefit. The consequence was that Prussia had some difficulty in securing admission to the Congress of Paris; after the signature of the treaty Bismarck drew up a report which was one of

his most brilliant and penetrating productions. "From time to time," he wrote, "during the last hundred years, and in every century since the reign of Charles V, German dualism has been obliged to settle its disputes by a domestic war. It is my conviction that at no distant time we shall have to fight with Austria for our very existence, and that it is not in our power to avoid the struggle." With no less clearness did Bismarck foretell the expulsion of Austria from Italy.

In 1859 Bismarck was appointed minister at the court of St. Petersburg, upon the eve of the Austrian war against France and Sardinia. Bismarck had clearly shown that his sympathies lay with the Franco-Sardinian party, and that the time had come for Prussia to make herself independent of Austria. The opposition naturally considered that the cause of Austria was a national one, and that Prussia should join in support of it with the smaller German states; but Bismarck insisted that the terms German and Prussian were two totally different conceptions, and that the reconstruction of the Federal bond would be necessary before the term German could become a symbol of national unity. "I see," he wrote, "in our relations with the *Bund* the infirmity of Prussia which will have to be cured sooner or later by fire and sword." These were the sentiments which had probably induced the prince regent to send Bismarck to St. Petersburg. During the highly inflammable condition of affairs he was just as well out of the way upon the Neva, where he remained from the spring of 1859 to the spring of 1862. After the battles of Magenta and Solferino, Prussia adopted an attitude of armed mediation and steadily rejected the overtures of Austria, much to the delight of Bismarck, who watched events from the distant Russian capital.

In 1861 Frederick William IV died, and the prince regent succeeded him as William I. Bismarck's influence over the new ruler was very great; he returned to Prussia for the ceremony of the coronation, and in the following year he went to Paris as Prussian ambassador. But in September he was hastily recalled by King William, who felt that he needed a strong man at the head of his cabinet. The mobilization of the Prussian army during the course of the Austrian war in Italy had revealed certain grave defects which William I was determined to overcome. Frederick the Great had raised a larger and more efficient force in his much smaller kingdom than Prussia could at this time command. A larger number of men and a new system of compulsory service was proposed, together with a considerable grant of money. In these reforms the king was supported by the military genius of Moltke. The matter was complicated by the popular idea that the royal power in Prussia must be checked, and that the centre of gravity of political influence belonged to the middle classes. The chamber could see no reason for the maintenance of the army, the use of which was only apparent to those who were versed in the tortuous ways of diplomacy and which seemed to the country at large but an additional means of aggrandizing the power of the crown. The army question thus became the outward pretext upon which two bodies

of constitutional theorists came into conflict. On 23 September, 1862, the chamber declined to grant the sum necessary to complete the military reforms unless the king on his side was prepared to make concessions which would endanger the efficiency of the new scheme. The cabinet, unable to face the chamber, resigned, and the king replied by appointing Bismarck president of the ministry.

His work as the unifier of Germany now begins, but it must also be remembered that the revival of monarchical power upon a conservative basis was equally his work, and was the means by which he regarded his final achievements as alone possible. At the very outset he had a difficult legal question before him. The chamber would not grant supplies for army reforms; the king and the crown prince declined to alter their military estimates. Bismarck therefore advised the king to rule without a budget, and the result was four years of strife and wrangling. But Bismarck remained immovable. Torrents of abuse, multitudes of lampoons, were showered upon him by press and chamber, but no one was ever cooler under parliamentary fire, and no one was ever more contemptuous of professors and doctrinaires who poured forth turbid streams of eloquence upon the themes of tyranny and revolution. Bismarck clung to his one great principle. "It is not," he said, "by speechifying that the great question of the day will have to be decided, but by blood and iron." This famous assertion, which was made on 30 September, 1862, even shook the determination of the king for a moment. For four years the state was administered without a constitutionally settled budget; the freedom of the press and of the societies was restricted by special enactments; the crown prince joined Bismarck's opponents, thinking that the procedure of the ministry might produce further revolution in Prussia, and Bismarck was obliged to restrain his master from harsh measures against the crown prince, which might have enabled him to pose as a martyr. In 1863 a large majority of the chamber decided that the private fortunes of ministers should be liable for any expenditure outside the terms of the regular budget.

Amid this commotion Bismarck guided the foreign policy of his country with extraordinary decision and independence. Between the years 1850-62 Prussia's influence in the councils of Europe was entirely negligible. Her policy during the Crimean war, however vital to the interests of the country, had done nothing to advance her prestige in Europe. When Cavour was struggling to rearrange a combination of European alliances which might change the policy of France and Austria, he regarded Prussia as hardly worthy of consideration, and King William's devotion to the service of the state, and his interest in the army, would have produced little effect had it not been supported by the daring decision of Bismarck. Bismarck's attitude, for instance, upon the Polish insurrection of 1863 clearly showed the definite character of his policy, and the unswerving decision with which he pursued it. In face of the animosity of his fellow citizens, and the opposition of Britain and France, he supported Russia in her sup-

pression of the Poles. The demands of foreign powers for intervention were treated with contemptuous disdain. His conversation with the Austrian ambassador, Count Karolyi, was a similar example of plain speaking. Austria had brought forward a proposal for federal reform which consisted in the convocation of a kind of national assembly composed of delegates from the chambers of the different states. This proposal had been introduced without the consent of Prussia. Bismarck advised the count to follow the example of Metternich and secure Prussia's previous consent upon all arrangements concerning German affairs. He also declared to the count that Austria might either withdraw from Germany, and shift its political centre to the east, or upon the occasion of the first European war Prussia would be found in the ranks of her opponents. This was plain speaking, to which the Austrian court was not accustomed, but Bismarck was well aware that a quarrel must come sooner or later and relied upon the reorganized army to make his words good.

These minor questions sank into the background before the problem of Schleswig-Holstein. On 15 November, 1863, King Frederick VII of Denmark died, and the main line of the royal house became extinct. The provinces of Schleswig and Holstein had been attached to the Danish kingdom much as Hanover had been attached to the British crown, by dynastic and personal relationship. The late sovereign had been duke of Schleswig-Holstein, and as duke of Holstein and Lauenburg he had been represented in the Germanic Diet. Linguistic and geographical conditions showed that the provinces were more properly parts of Germany than of Denmark, but by the Treaty of London, 1852, the king of Denmark had guaranteed that both duchies should maintain their local institutions and independence, and had undertaken not to incorporate them with the rest of the Danish monarchy. At the same time the spirit of this treaty had been constantly, and the letter of it occasionally, broken, and when Prussia was involved in difficulties with the Polish rising, Frederick VII promptly took measures to incorporate the two provinces with Denmark, which act was confirmed by his successor, Christian IX. The new ruler's ducal title was, however, open to question. Prince Frederick of Augustenburg came forward claiming the succession to the duchies, amid great enthusiasm both in Schleswig and Holstein and throughout Germany at large. There was an immediate outcry that Prussia should support the prince of Augustenburg, but Bismarck pointed out that both Prussia and Austria were parties to the treaty of London, which had recognized King Christian IX as duke of Schleswig-Holstein. They should wait and see whether the new ruler would disavow the acts of his predecessor, and not interfere until he had definitely declined to do so; otherwise if Prussia abandoned the treaty of London she would have no real pretext for interfering in Schleswig, which stood outside the German confederation. The opposition retorted that the Danes had been allowed to violate the treaty of London for the past twelve years, and that now was the time to put an end to an intolerable situation.

They did not realize that Bismarck was determined to acquire the duchies for Prussia. When the moment arrived he forced Austria to join him in an attack upon Denmark. Early in 1864 war began, and when the Prussian forces stormed the lines of Düppel it became obvious that further Danish resistance was futile. Discussion then began concerning the future fate of the duchies. During the progress of negotiations they were placed under the administration of an Austro-Prussian commission, the members of which spent their time in issuing contradictory instructions and thwarting one another's measures. Austria supported the popular demand in the duchies themselves for the installation of the prince of Augustenburg as their new ruler. Bismarck was not disinclined to this solution, provided that Prussia gained a definite return for the blood and treasure which she had expended, and a strong principality on her northern frontier. After prolonged negotiations the question was solved by the Treaty of Gastein in 1865, which gave the sovereignty of Schleswig to Prussia, and of Holstein to Austria, while Lauenburg was ceded to Prussia for £650,000. Thus the imminent breach between Austria and Prussia seemed to have been closed for the moment, though Bismarck characterized the treaty as a patching of the crack in the building. He was already in communication with Napoleon III, and was aware that he could rely upon the neutrality of France in the event of a war with Austria.

While Bismarck's foreign policy was thus successful, the domestic government remained as turbulent and disorderly as ever. In the chamber the liberal party again rejected the new military law, though they had had ocular proof of its success in the recent war. The nation had acquired a splendid harbour at Kiel, but proposals for the construction of a fleet were met with a flat negative. In 1866 an attempt was actually made to assassinate Bismarck by a doctrinaire fanatic, whose hand the minister seized in the nick of time. The news of his escape roused great popular rejoicings, and showed that the unpopularity manifested against him in the chamber was not so deeply seated as he might have supposed. The position of Prussia in Schleswig, and of Austria in Holstein, was obviously impossible. Bismarck accused the Vienna court of encouraging the spirit of revolution in the duchies and attempting to pave the way for the establishment of Prince Frederick. The replies were so unsatisfactory that he informed the Austrian ambassador of Prussia's intentions to resume her policy, and to consolidate her own interests, as she was convinced that it was impossible to act any longer with Austria. Austria had declined to listen to any proposals for putting an end to an intolerable system of rivalry, and war seemed to be the only solution. But in Bismarck's view the war was not to be fought merely for the sake of Schleswig-Holstein: a united Germany was to be the real object of the struggle. Negotiations were opened with the Italian Government, and a defensive and offensive alliance was concluded for three months on 8 April, 1866. Meanwhile the Austrians were moving troops towards their frontier and

were accused by Prussia of attempting intimidation. Again, there was the attitude of France to consider. The tortuous policy of Napoleon III desired a war in Germany, that France might pursue her designs upon Belgium and the Rhine district. On the other hand, Napoleon knew that Bismarck would never persuade William I to fight unless the Italian alliance was secure, and to French persuasion its conclusion was largely due. By 1 June Austrian patience was exhausted; she declared that the Schleswig-Holstein question should be submitted to the Diet and also summoned representatives of the estates of Holstein, that the province might decide its own fate. Prussia immediately replied that such action was a denunciation of the Treaty of Gastein, and sent troops into Holstein, before whom the Austrians retired precipitately. On 12 June Prussia was in full possession of the two provinces. By this time diplomatic intercourse between Vienna and Berlin was broken off; Bismarck sent ultimatums to the sovereigns of Saxony, Hanover, and Hesse-Cassel, asking whether they would join Prussia or take the consequences. As they declined to join, their states were immediately occupied by Prussian troops and King George of Hanover was sent as a prisoner to Stettin. The attention of the country then turned towards the Austrian frontier, and the diplomatic genius of Bismarck gave way to the military genius of Moltke.

Public opinion in France was widely convinced that Austria was a stronger power than Prussia. The Austrian commander, Von Benedek, was a capable leader of small operations, but was well aware of his own incapacity to conduct an extensive campaign. Austrian tactics, again, had been rendered obsolete by the Prussian needle gun, and the war of 1859 in Italy had caused a revival in favour of shock tactics. The Austrian rifle had a very high trajectory, and the dash of the French charges had often carried them safely through the rain of bullets. Moltke, however, insisted that the infantry should make full use of their special musketry power, and that no advance should be made until the enemy's line had been broken. These tactics secured the Prussian victory in the early engagements and provided a foretaste of their final success in the battle of Königgrätz, or Sadowa, at which Bismarck and the king were present. Moltke's strategy had determined to involve the Austrian forces between two converging armies, and until the crown prince reached the Austrian right the fortune of the day seemed desperate. After a conflict of eight hours Prussia defeated her enemy with the loss of 40,000 men, eleven standards, and 174 guns. Prussia's position was now secure, and the defeat of the Italians by the Austrians at Custoza was no compensation for their overwhelming loss upon German soil.

The Austrian emperor, after the battle, invited the mediation of France, and the Paris newspapers announced, on 5 July, 1866, that Venice had been ceded to the emperor Napoleon by Austria, to be held in trust for Italy. Austria was confident that the French emperor would then persuade Italy to adopt a neutral position, and would check the victorious advance of the Prussians by placing a French army on

the Rhine. France, however, was unprepared for war. Napoleon, who was himself in ill health, was persuaded, both by his own ministers and by the Prussian ambassador, that an amicable arrangement with Prussia would be more advantageous to him, and he therefore resolved to try to win some territorial concessions by means of negotiations. This was a fatal mistake. France was kept in suspense by the astute Prussian diplomats and eventually found herself left out in the cold. By the Peace of Nicolsburg, Austria agreed to the Prussian annexation of Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and the free state of Frankfort. The North-German Confederation was to be reorganized under Prussian military supremacy, while to the South-German Confederation independence was to be assured. The only advantage which Austria gained from French support was the moral strength to save Saxony from annexation by Prussia. Bismarck was persuaded to yield this point, provided that the addition to the kingdom of the new South-German Confederation was secured. King William would have liked to acquire parts of Silesia and Bohemia for Prussia, but gave way to the representations of Bismarck, who pointed out the wisdom of treating Austria with moderation and magnanimity. The South-German states had also invited the intervention of Napoleon, but Bismarck had dexterously succeeded in concluding secret treaties with most of them, by which they agreed to serve under the military supremacy of Prussia in the event of national war. When, therefore, the French ambassador came forward at the conclusion of negotiations with a demand that the Rhine frontier of 1814 should be restored to France, he found that the ground had been cut from beneath his feet, and that he had no basis upon which to negotiate. France retired for the moment from the diplomatic struggle bitterly disappointed, and resolved by one means or another to gain some accession of territory for herself. Bismarck, who never let an advantage slip, was careful that the country should be fully informed of her intentions, and France was defeated in the field of diplomacy long before she appealed to the decision of arms.


On 24 February, 1867, the first meeting was opened of the first North-German Parliament, which was composed of 300 deputies from the various allied states chosen by universal suffrage. Representatives of the allied states had already drawn up a federal charter according to which the legislative power was to be vested in two bodies: the Reichstag, representing the people, and the Bundesrath, composed of delegates from the allied states under the permanent presidency of Prussia. The latter assembly, or federal council, performed the function of the British House of Lords and of the crown, and controlled all executive power in matters which concerned the foreign relations of the confederation. Administrative expenses were to be contributed by the several states in proportion to their populations. All were to be liable to universal military service, and individual states retained full administrative ability to manage their own domestic affairs. Such, in brief outline, was the Federal constitution which

the first North-German Parliament had now to discuss. It was eventually accepted, after a great deal of wrangling upon theoretical points, without which few Teutonic assemblies can ever accomplish business. Bismarck, with his penetrative common sense, regarded much of the discussion as futile. In his powerful speech on 11 March, 1867, he showed his early grip of the situation in an appeal to those who refused to sanction the diminution of the Prussian budget rights in the case of the army estimates:

The mighty movements which last year brought nations from the Baltic to the Adriatic, from the Rhine to the Carpathians, to play the iron game of hazard where royal and imperial crowns are staked, and the thousands of victims of the sword and of disease who sealed the national advantage by their death cannot be reconciled with the resolution *ad acta*. Gentlemen, if you believe that, you have not grasped the situation. How would you answer the veteran of Königgratz, if he enquired into the consequences of these mighty efforts. You would say to him, perhaps: "It is true that nothing has been done to advance German union, but that will come in time. None the less we have saved the budget right of the Prussian chamber of deputies, the right of endangering every year the existence of the Prussian army. It was for this that we fought with the emperor under the walls of Pressburg. Take this consolation to your heart, brave soldier, and with this let the widow console herself as she weeps by her husband's grave." Gentlemen, such a position as that is an impossibility. Let us work, let us put Germany in the saddle and she will soon learn to ride.

It was no time to be squabbling about constitutional trifles when France was avariciously examining the frontiers of the confederation in the hope of discovering a breach where she could intervene to her advantage. On 17 April the constitution of the North-German Confederation was carried by a large majority, and Germany was at last able to offer a united front to any opposition.

Meanwhile France was anxious to obtain the price of her neutrality during the recent struggle. As her request for the restoration of the Rhine frontier had been flatly refused, she thought that Prussia at least could hardly object if she proceeded to aggrandize herself at the expense of a foreigner. Napoleon considered that the possession of Luxemburg and Belgium would satisfy his needs, and a secret treaty was drafted for the purpose, which Bismarck revealed to Europe at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870. William III, the ruler of the Netherlands, was practically persuaded by France to hand over Luxemburg for a cash payment and a French guarantee of the integrity of his Dutch dominions. But when Bismarck published the secret alliance with Bavaria, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt, King William understood that Prussia was not in the least likely to consent to a French occupation of Luxemburg. Napoleon's military resources were not equal to a conflict with Germany, and negotiations therefore collapsed. French prestige was further lowered by the disastrous termination of her Mexican policy. But a conference at London, to



which Prussia agreed, decided that Luxemburg should be declared neutral while remaining in the German customs union, and Prussia withdrew her garrison from the former federal fortress, which was dismantled. Bismarck was no more anxious for war at that juncture than was France. The attitude of Austria was by no means certain, and there was much work to be done in the way of preparations. For the next three years he was fully occupied with the task of unifying and consolidating north and south Germany. Deputies from the states south of the Main were joined to representatives of the northern confederation and formed a new customs control to deal with the trade and finances of the nation. Meanwhile their armies had been re-organized upon the Prussian method and re-armed with the Prussian needle gun. The customs union was re-established upon a new basis, and though the political results seemed at first to be small, it was obvious that the two confederations were gradually moving together.

Meanwhile France continued the irritating and tortuous policy which had been exemplified by the Luxemburg affair, and began to intrigue with the hope of interfering in Schleswig. The famous Salzburg interview increased the animosity which these proceedings aroused in Germany. The French imperial couple paid a visit for private reasons to the emperor of Austria, but Germany persisted in seeing political motives behind the meeting, and the movement for amalgamation was correspondingly stimulated. At the same time amalgamation was by no means an immediate prospect. While Bismarck avoided giving umbrage to France, he was quite aware that a war was sooner or later inevitable. The contribution of 100,000,000 francs which Germany made to the building of the St. Gothard tunnel was a far-sighted act upon the part of Bismarck, and one which helped to detach Italy from France. But the relations between the two countries were far from improved, and Paris regarded the railway convention between Italy and Switzerland and Germany as highly detrimental to her own interests. But on 30 June, 1870, the peace of Europe seemed to be secure. The French premier, Ollivier, declared that no disturbance threatened from any quarter, and the minister of war considered that a smaller number of recruits for the year might be enlisted. Prussian officers were away upon leave, the king was taking the waters at Ems, Bismarck was resting from his herculean labours in Pomerania, while Moltke was enjoying the seclusion of his Silesian estate. Yet within a fortnight France and Germany were at war.

Queen Isabella had been driven out of Spain by the liberal party, who offered the throne to the duke of Genoa and to the titular king of Portugal, both of whom declined. They then turned to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern, after the Spanish premier had consulted King William. The king regarded the matter as a purely family concern and did not see that he had any right of prohibition. Bismarck advised the prince to accept; probably he saw that though the proposals proceeded from Madrid, and not from Berlin, they might

well be turned to the advantage of Germany. In any case the whole matter was a private concern of the Spanish nation, and any elected king would naturally be obliged to renounce his hereditary rights to another throne, though in the case of Leopold no renunciation would be necessary. None the less the news of his candidature caused a tremendous explosion in Paris, and the French were convinced that they had to deal with a deep-laid stratagem on the part of Bismarck against the interests and the honour of France. Explanations from Madrid produced no effect upon their feelings, and the French ambassador had an interview with King William at Ems. But prince Leopold, seeing the tension caused by his candidature, withdrew on 12 July. At this point the incident might have been considered closed, but the French ambassador, Benedetti, was ordered to obtain an undertaking from King William that Leopold's candidature should never again be renewed. This request naturally met with a refusal, and the king could only get rid of the ambassador by declining to communicate with him except through his aide-de-camp. He left it to Bismarck's discretion how much of these proceedings should be communicated to the press. Bismarck had no intention of endangering the national union, just struggling into existence, by inflicting upon it a deep national humiliation. On 13 July, at eleven o'clock at night, he sent out a verbatim copy of the king's telegram from Ems, which ran as follows:—

After the news of the resignation of Prince Hohenzollern had been officially communicated to the imperial French Government by the royal Spanish Government, the French ambassador in Ems further requested His Majesty the king to authorize him to telegraph to Paris that His Majesty pledged himself for the future never to give his assent if the Hohenzollern should renew their candidature. His Majesty thereupon declined to grant another audience to the French ambassador, and informed the latter through his aide-de-camp that His Majesty had no further communication to make to the ambassador.

Whether the publication of this document was in itself the cause of war, whether it was an insult to France, whether it did not rather represent France as the insulting party, whether the real grievance to France was the previous insult offered by King William to Napoleon, are questions more or less beside the mark. The St. Gothard tunnel affair might just as well have become the occasion of war as the candidature of Prince Leopold.

Napoleon felt that a war was necessary for the support of his dynasty. Bismarck knew that war was inevitable. On 19 July war was declared in Berlin by the French *chargé d'affaires*. The declaration produced an effect upon Germany which Bismarck's well-meant and patriotic efforts in the cause of unity had never been able to accomplish. Internal feuds, racial animosities, and local rivalries were immediately forgotten, and with these vanished the mistaken hopes of France that Germany, as on previous occasions, might be

defeated with the aid of Germans. The leaders of the south felt that the trend of public opinion behind them had changed, and that treaty rights and patriotism alike called them together round the standard of Prussia. The king's journey from Ems to Berlin was virtually a triumphal march. His speech from the throne was greeted by a whirlwind of applause.

If Germany silently endured in past centuries the violation of her rights and her honour, she endured only because in her distraction she did not know her strength. To-day, when her armour shows no flaw to the enemy, she has the will and the power to resist the renewed violation of the French. God will be with us as with our fathers.

One hundred and twenty million thalers were voted for the conduct of the war, and for the first time in German history Germany acted as a united whole. Meanwhile Bismarck's publication of the French draft treaties secured the neutrality of foreign nations, and of Britain in particular. Russia was favourably disposed to Prussia; Italy felt that to offer support to France would endanger the growing unity of the country; nor would Napoleon buy her support by the surrender of Rome. Austria meditated interference, but without Italy she could not venture to act, and the first Prussian victories soon forced her to realize her impotence.

Great was the contrast between the work of mobilization in France and Germany. The French minister of war had asserted that the forces were ready to the last gaiter button, but events soon showed that this ideal was very far from realization. The munitions of war were in every respect inadequate; the existing railways were not equal to the strain of conveying 300,000 troops to the seat of war; regiments were not organized upon geographical principles—Alsatiens had to travel to the south of France to join their colours, southerners were obliged to make their way to Brittany. The result was extraordinary confusion, whereas Moltke was able to remark that the fourteen days of German mobilization were some of the quietest of his life; everything had been foreseen and provided with scientific accuracy. On the evening of 31 July the king of Prussia left Berlin for the seat of war, accompanied by Bismarck, who went forth to do the diplomatic work of the campaign at the head of a devoted train of secretaries and servants, including Dr. Busch, whose Memoirs of these events are well known. On 2 August the king took command of the united German armies at Mayence, and a series of battles began which soon left France disorganized and demoralized, without armies, emperor, or government. The battles of Wörth and Spicheren produced a terrible disillusionment at Paris. For weeks the deluded inhabitants had been shouting "A Berlin!" they now proceeded to throw the blame of the recent disasters upon the Government. The ministry was overthrown, the empire itself was in danger, and the emperor was hesitating in Metz while the German armies were advancing upon the line of the Vosges. When they reached the Moselle, public opinion drove

Napoleon to resign the supreme command to Marshal Bazaine, who enjoyed the full confidence of the army, while he himself hastily joined Macmahon at Chalons. By 18 August the brilliant strategy of the Germans, and the heroic courage which reached its climax at Gravelotte, had enclosed the great French army within a circle drawn round Metz. Bazaine was lost unless Macmahon's army stretched out a helping hand. Moltke was resolved to prevent this movement, and began a march towards Paris accompanied by the great chancellor. When the German leader learned that the French were marching upon Rheim, apparently with the intention of returning upon Metz, Moltke ordered his armies to wheel to the right and take Macmahon in the rear. The movement, which occupied nearly three days and extended over an irregular frontage of nearly 50 miles, was executed by some 200,000 men. Dangerous as it was, and magnificently as it was performed, its possibility was only achieved by the splendid scouting work of the German cavalry. Macmahon had missed his chance of attacking Germany at the moment of danger, or of reaching Bazaine, and wished to fall back upon Paris, but this the home Government forbade, and he therefore retired to the fortress of Sedan, hoping that he might make his way northwards along the Belgian frontier. To the east, west, and north-west his progress was barred by German armies; attacks and counterattacks followed in rapid succession. The brilliant French cavalry charges proved fruitless; the French army was driven back to Sedan, a position commanded upon every side by 618 German guns. Annihilation or surrender were the only alternatives. Marshal Macmahon was wounded, and after a ten hours' bombardment the white flag was raised (2 September), and the German officer sent by the king to meet the French emissaries was conducted, to his amazement, into the presence of Napoleon himself. Eighty-three thousand Frenchmen became prisoners of war with 558 guns. The Emperor Napoleon was detained in honourable confinement near Cassel till the end of the war. In the moment of this stupendous success fatigue and exertion were forgotten by the troops; their thanksgivings found expression in hymns, while the Prussian king, who had been the emperor's guest in Paris but three years before, at the time of the Great Exhibition, was unable to restrain his emotion upon the first meeting with his prostrate adversary. The same evening, at the royal headquarters, the king proposed the toast of Roon, the minister of war who whetted the sword, of Moltke who wielded it, and of Bismarck who had raised Prussia to her present prominence by his direction of her policy in past years. But it was himself who had rendered the efforts of these men possible, and now, if ever, he was a speaking example of the aphorism of Louis XIV: "Government is choice: choice of men and choice of means".

The victory of Sedan, while it evoked a triumphant outburst of pride and thankfulness in Germany, also produced two definite demands: that so splendid a result should be consecrated by political unity, a request voiced with special persistence by the sovereign

NAPOLEON III AND BISMARCK. From a painting by Wilhelm Camphausen by permission of the Berlin Photographic Company.

This picture, painted by the German painter Wilhelm Camphausen (1818-85), represents the meeting of the vanquished Napoleon III with his conqueror Prince Bismarck on the morning after the surrender of the French army at Sedan. Camphausen specialized in military pictures, and accompanied Prussian armies in the field during the three Bismarckian wars of 1864, 1866, and 1870-1. He had previously painted many scenes from the Thirty Years' War, the English Civil War, and the wars of Frederick the Great.



NAPOLEON III AND BISMARCK

(Copyright, Berlin Photographic Company)

CAMPHAUSEN

states, and that the western province of Alsace and German Lorraine, with Strasburg and Metz, should now become definitely German. The effect of Sedan upon France was the downfall of the French empire. A republic was proclaimed under General Trochu, who formed a ministry in which the leading members were Favre and Gambetta. The republicans declared that they would not cede an inch of national territory or a stone of any fortress, and meanwhile the Germans marched straight upon Paris while preserving their close investment of Metz. Strasburg and the other Alsatian fortresses were captured, and in the course of a fortnight the Germans were within reach of Paris. Bismarck remained quartered for five months in Versailles, busily occupied with the diplomatic work of the war. There was no guarantee that the republican Government would be allowed to continue. Bismarck wanted a Government which was strong enough to negotiate a peace, and whether it was an empire or a republic was a matter of indifference to him. In the meantime the Germans suffered under the guerrilla warfare of the Franc-tireurs, and the country suffered under their reprisals. The army of Metz, famine-stricken and diseased, had surrendered unconditionally (28 October), and 173,000 men, with a vast quantity of military stores, fell into the hand of Germany. Then came the last phase of the struggle, when Gambetta left Paris in a balloon and began the task of "raising legions from the soil with the stamp of his foot". His appeal to the patriotism of the country gathered 600,000 men within four months, but patriotism alone was of no use in such a war. Drill and training were wanting in the new forces; weapons had to be imported from abroad, and in the new army fifteen different kinds of gun were in use at the same time. Gambetta did but uselessly prolong the struggle, and only his enthusiasm could ever have inspired the idea that the untrained could succeed where the professional soldiers had failed.

Meanwhile German people were impatient to cement the unity in which they had learned that their strength lay. The southern states invited Bismarck to facilitate their immediate adherence to the northern confederation. Bismarck was obliged to conduct negotiations from Versailles, nor was it such an easy task as might have been supposed. Bavaria, for instance, made conditions which a lesser man than Bismarck might have been tempted to reject. However, after an infinite amount of trouble, he overcame all obstacles, and the king of Prussia received a letter from the king of Bavaria begging him in the name of his fellow sovereigns to assume the imperial title as head of the confederation. In the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, a spot famous in the annals of French history, King William assumed the title of German emperor (18 January, 1871) amid cheers, waving swords, and the national anthem thundered forth by bands, a sight to make Richelieu and the Grand Monarch turn in their graves. Bismarck was able to realize that this was his work. Little more than a hundred and fifty years previously the regent of Prussia

assumed the title of king amid the contempt of Europe. He was now the emperor of the most powerful nation in Europe, thanks to the patient genius and penetrating insight of his chancellor.

Upon the Loire and round Dijon the last efforts of France had been hopelessly defeated, one great French disaster consisting in the flight of Bourbaki, with 80,000 men, into Swiss territory. Provisions in Paris were getting scarcer, the populace was becoming restive, and yet the siege was lasting far longer than might have been expected; German public opinion demanded the bombardment of the city to bring the war to an end. By Christmas-time preparations for this purpose had been made. General Trochu's attempt at a final sortie with 90,000 men was completely defeated, and on 28 January Paris surrendered to the Germans. In spite of the furious hostility of Gambetta, Thiers, as head of the new French republic, went to meet Bismarck at Versailles to discuss the conditions of peace. The chancellor demanded the whole of Alsace, including Strasburg and Belfort, part of Lorraine with Metz, and an indemnity of £240,000,000, with the entry of the German army into Paris. After much discussion he consented to remit one-sixth of the proposed indemnity and to waive his claim to Belfort. The preliminaries of peace were signed on 26 February, and on 1 March the army of 30,000 German troops made their triumphal entry into Paris. Ten days later Bismarck was back in Berlin, already looking forward to the work of consolidating the empire which he had created. If Germany had lost 45,000 men in the course of the war she had gained advantages which far counterbalanced these losses. The day of Louis XIV and of the Napoleons had come to an end, and German unity had been assured.

Heavy as Bismarck's labours had been during the course of the war the conclusion of the great struggle brought no relaxation for him. To describe in detail his foreign policy during the next ten years would be to relate a large portion of modern European history. He had also to guide his country in the difficult task of accommodating itself to the new imperial constitution, an instrument admitted by all sides to be by no means without flaw. The empire included Danish, Polish, and French-speaking races, states which could not forget their individualism; to industrial success imbued with the revolutionary spirit was added antagonism between Church and State. There was the further problem of the administration of the newly conquered provinces; and the question of army reform, that what had been won might be retained; the great railway question, arising from the interruption of internal commerce by a multiplicity of railway tariffs. New judicature acts were required, for there was no civil code which embraced the whole of the new confederation, and if Bismarck did not succeed in solving all these problems, yet much was achieved, and the great indemnity which he had won from France and which was paid with surprising rapidity brought prosperity to the country which facilitated his efforts.

The first ten years of the new empire were largely occupied by



By permission of the

Berlin Photographic Company

PROCLAMATION OF WILLIAM I AS GERMAN EMPEROR : VERSAILLES, 18TH JANUARY, 1871

From the painting by Anton von Werner

the so-called Kulturkampf, a catchword invented by Professor Virchow of Berlin to imply that the victory of the state would be a victory of culture over barbarism. In the first German Reichstag the Centre formed a strong Catholic party which attempted to secure German interference in Italy for the purpose of restoring the Pope to his temporal power, and desired that under the Prussian constitution the Church should be completely free from state control. Neither Bismarck nor the Government were persuaded, and both complained that the Catholic clergy in West Prussia were supporting the Polish national movement, and were using their influence in the elementary schools for that purpose. The appointment of Falk to the ministry of public worship and instruction began a period of definite opposition to Roman Catholicism. Foreign jurisdiction for Prussian clergy was abolished; clergy were to be educated in state institutions, and when the bishops made appointments to benefices, their nominations were to be revised by the state. Religious orders were abolished except in the case of houses which devoted themselves to the care of the sick and the poor. These laws were completed by 1875, and the vast majority of the Catholic population declined to obey them. The introduction of civil marriage in 1875 and the repression of the Jesuits gave an advantage to the state. Then the Catholic party was itself defeated, and the so-called national Catholics, while recognizing the infallibility of the Pope, asserted at the same time that the state was independent within its own territory. The Catholics enlisted the sympathies of the Empress Augusta, who was able to put many obstacles in the path of Bismarck and of Falk. Bismarck had declared that his chief hope lay in a peace-loving Pope, and when Leo XIII came to the Papal Chair in 1878 negotiations began which eventually produced a truce in 1887. The Government surrendered upon such points as the training of the clergy in state institutions, and the state control of the schools, but the right of appointment to vacant benefices was retained. Bishops and priests who had been exiled were restored to their sees and benefices, and as the state showed a more conciliatory spirit the agitation gradually became less formidable.

It was then necessary to face the social and economic question. The industrial revolution introduced by the invention of steam power naturally brought into existence the so-called social democrats, who considered that the capitalist who hired workmen for wages was making an unfair profit out of his fellow men, and who aimed at replacing capitalist supremacy by collective ownership for the purpose of production. Karl Marx provided the Scriptures of the movement by the composition of his great work, *Das Kapital*; the statistics of this work were borrowed from Britain, and many of the ideas from Britain and France, but the whole was welded together by Hegelian philosophy with masterly skill. Under such leaders as Ferdinand Lassalle, the movement spread apace, and after the war of 1870 hundreds of new factories sprang up; over-production proceeded rapidly,

and numbers of countrymen left their agricultural occupations for the towns. By the end of 1873 the reaction had reduced many of them to starvation and strongly stimulated the forces of discontent. By 1875 the various sections, under the guidance of Lassalle and other leaders, united as a social labour party, and won more than twenty seats in the Reichstag of 1877. In May 1878 a certain Hodel, a plumber's assistant, attempted to assassinate the emperor, an attempt repeated by Dr. Nobiling in the following month. These outrages induced the Reichstag to accept strong legislation against the socialists for a period of two and a half years, which was afterwards prolonged. The clubs of the social democrats were broken up and their newspapers suppressed. Every channel of public agitation was stopped, and if the organization still existed in secret the members of it had learned the elementary lesson of law-abiding behaviour. But both Bismarck and the emperor were convinced that mere repressive measures were useless, and that a new social problem had risen with which they were bound to grapple. In 1881 they began a series of measures in the interests of social reform. Banks were founded for the support of workmen when injured or in sickness; provision was made for their insurance against old age; Sunday rest in all industrial occupations was assured: forms of national socialism strongly opposed by the German radical party and also by the social democrats. The radicals considered that Bismarck went too far and the social democrats that he did not go far enough. The progress of German socialism since Bismarck's day is enough to show with what accuracy he had foretold the importance of the movement.

Bismarck also laid the foundations of such colonial empire as Germany possesses. He was in no haste to acquire colonies for the empire, for the reason that such acquisition increased the possibility of discord with other nations, while Germany was obliged to be on her guard against French vengeance. He was also of opinion that colonies must rather grow than be acquired ready-made. But in 1884 he took under the protection of the empire territory acquired by a Bremen merchant, Luderitz, from the Hottentots in south-west Africa. Commercial companies were then formed which established themselves in New Guinea, various South Sea Islands, the Cameroons, Togo Land, and elsewhere, and eventually secured the protection of the empire and the acquisition of territory which they had occupied. Germany was able to act with Britain in the anti-slavery blockade of the East-African coast frontier. Conferences and negotiations secured the delimitation of so-called spheres of influence.

On 9 March, 1888, the Emperor William I died, to the great grief of the chancellor who had stood by his side through many stirring passages in the history of their country. The chancellor was received by the new emperor Frederick with the greatest cordiality and affection, but in a short time they were divided upon the question of the marriage of the Princess Victoria to Prince Alexander of Battenberg, ex-prince

of Bulgaria. Bismarck felt that such an alliance would endanger the peace of Europe and disturb the relations of Germany and Russia; but unfortunately the emperor, who was then dying of an incurable disease, felt that his last hours were disturbed by the controversies which raged round this question. Friction was caused by the affair of Dr. Geffcken, who published certain portions of the Emperor Frederick's diary after his death, with the object of showing that the crown prince, and not Bismarck, was really the founder of the empire, and finally, on 22 March, 1890, Bismarck was dismissed from office by the Emperor William II. Bismarck had found upon previous occasions that a threat of resignation had horrified the nation, and had enabled him to bend Parliament and Government to his will; but the same threat, when exerted against the new ruler, was literally taken, and at the age of seventy-five he left office with a display of honour and deference which he himself compared to a first-class funeral. The primary cause of this separation was, perhaps, a divergence of views upon the labour question, and the question whether a minister should be responsible to himself or to the crown, while incompatibility of age and temper were probably even more cogent reasons. Whatever the grievances of Bismarck, it must be said that he had at least begun to create an empire within an empire; he was a centre of force in some such sense as Wallenstein had been in previous ages; he had appropriated certain rights and much influence which more properly belonged to the crown. Nor was the period of his retirement entirely dignified. Explosions of wrath and sarcastic growls were far too common. It was not until Bismarck expressed his approval of the emperor's naval policy that the breach was temporarily healed. The reconciliation was of no long duration, and on 30 July, 1898, Bismarck died, amid the general mourning of the whole German people. A great and imposing figure, a herculean worker, his achievements speak for him, and few nations have produced, in the words of the emperor himself, "a more admirable master of statecraft, a more fearless fighter in war as in peace, a more devoted son of the Fatherland or servant of his emperor and king".

CHAPTER XIII

Garibaldi (A.D. 1807-1882)

Giuseppe Garibaldi was born on 4 July, 1807, at Nice, then Nizza and an Italian city. Two years earlier, and 100 miles farther along the coast, another Joseph had been born, Giuseppe Mazzini, who was to take a no less important share in the task of liberating and unifying Italy. Garibaldi's family were pure Italians; his father, Domenico, was a small merchant captain, owner of the vessel in which he gained a livelihood as a trader. He gave his son the best education that he could afford; but the boy showed no inclination for a life of study on land; the sea attracted him from the outset. From the age of fifteen to twenty-five he worked his way from cabin boy to captain in the merchant service of Nice; he was known as a swimmer of extraordinary endurance, and as a bold and capable commander. To the dangers of navigation were added the perils of an unpoliced sea; on three occasions Garibaldi was captured or robbed by pirates, and in this stern school were developed the daring and indomitable perseverance which afterwards made him the hero of Italy.

Upon the fall of Napoleon, Nice and Garibaldi became subjects of Piedmont, under the rule of Victor Emmanuel I, king of Sardinia. The Congress of Vienna had reduced Italy to a "geographical expression", in Metternich's phrase. Austria had secured Venice and Lombardy and claimed to direct the affairs of the peninsula from this point of vantage. Naples was returned to the Bourbons. Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and Lucca were held by Hapsburg princes. The little republic of San Marino was the only refuge of freedom in the whole peninsula. But the short-lived free republics which Napoleon had established had raised desires for political liberty and aspirations for national unity which were only strengthened by the general suppression of every institution tending to liberalism. The Inquisition was reintroduced in the Papal states, and the king of Sardinia strove to eradicate every sign of French influence. The naturally resulting discontent produced the Carbonari rising of 1820 in Naples, and King Ferdinand, the ruler of Naples and Sicily, was induced to grant the Spanish constitution of 1812 to his subjects. Metternich then informed the Neapolitan liberals that Austria was resolved to maintain the old order of absolutism, and Austrian troops speedily made an end of Neapolitan defiance. Piedmont was equally unsuccessful in an attempt to drive the Austrians out of Lombardy, and for the next ten years



dingly the supporters of constitutional monarchy looked to Sardinia as the only royal house that might be regarded as liberal and national. Mazzini believed that education must precede revolution; in his own words: "Great ideas must come before great actions". He wished Italians to understand that their movement was no isolated sporadic outbreak, but was in continuity with the struggles proceeding in Hungary, Poland, Russia, and indeed almost everywhere in Europe. The liberty, equality, and fraternity of nations was the object of the present movement, as the liberty of the individual had been the object of the French Revolution. In this movement the leadership belonged to Italy; the Rome of the Caesars and the Rome of the Popes had ruled the world; it remained for the Rome of the Italians to rule again. This interpretation of history may have been mistaken, but it provided Mazzini with a series of splendid ideals which he strove to set before his nation with voice and pen. The services which he rendered to his country by arousing the spirit of patriotic nationalism were of inestimable value.

While Garibaldi was on the seas, great events were proceeding in Europe and in Italy. Metternich's system had collapsed; he himself was expelled from Vienna; Hungary and Bohemia had asserted their independence; France and Germany were in the hands of revolutionists. The king of Sardinia had seized the opportunity to declare war upon Austria, with an army augmented by exiles and volunteers from every quarter. The veteran Austrian general, Radetzky, had been driven out of Milan, and had fallen back upon the "Quadrilateral", the fortresses of Mantua, Verona, Peschiera, and Legnago, which protected the Austrian line of communications through the Brenner Pass. A less dilatory general than Charles Albert would never have allowed him to reach this advantageous position; while the king of Sardinia was as vacillating and incompetent a commander as he was personally courageous, the forces under his command were by no means united. There were local jealousies between the several cities and political factions, and there was a general incapacity for military reorganization which wasted resources and wearied enthusiasm. Garibaldi, republican though he was, offered his services to Charles Albert; the Government of Piedmont rejected his offer and he turned to the provisional Government of Milan, which sent him to Bergamo with a force utterly inadequate for serious operations. The battle of Custoza enabled the Austrians to resume possession of Milan, and after the armistice between Piedmont and Austria was signed, Garibaldi and his followers carried on a republican war against the enemy until they were driven across the Alps into Switzerland. Meanwhile a powerful ferment was rising in the Papal states.

Pius IX had aroused a tremendous outburst of enthusiasm by the liberal measures with which he attempted to reconcile the Papacy to the aspirations of the democrats. In Italy education had been discouraged, the importation of foreign literature prohibited, the press was under the severest censorship, while everyone suspected of a desire to think

or speak was subjected to constant espionage; letters were opened and arrests were frequent and summary. The result was to stimulate and to drive into revolutionary courses the secret societies—the Carbonari, the Freemasons, and Young Italy—for the organization of which Italians have always shown special capacity. Pio Nono released the prisoners, recalled the exiles, removed the embargo upon freedom of speech and print, and was rewarded with an outpouring of wildly demonstrative gratitude which eventually placed him in an embarrassing situation. Released liberalism showed a desire to democratize the whole Government, and Pio Nono found himself unable to control the spirit which he had liberated. Early in 1848 he was forced to pass a measure which associated elective deputies with the clerical officials in the legislature, and shortly afterwards he found that some 12,000 of his subjects were taking the field in his name against the Austrians. He declared that he had no desire for a breach with Austria, and when Charles Albert had signed the armistice and ended the Lombard War, in August, Pius had ceased to control the situation or to command the respect of his subjects. The leaders of the clubs and secret societies began to preach a vigorous anti-Austrian crusade, and in the autumn Garibaldi, who had returned from Switzerland and was seeking some other base from which he could conduct the people's war, entered the Papal states.

The Pope had fled to Naples in the last week of November, by which time Garibaldi had recruited a considerable force in the Romagna and elsewhere. He visited Rome in December and had an interview with the leaders of the provisional Government; early in 1849 a republic was proclaimed which welcomed Mazzini as a citizen. He hoped that Rome would become the centre of a radiating movement which would reunite the whole peninsula in one republic. But the time was not yet. Charles Albert, disgusted by the behaviour of the Austrians in Lombardy, and well aware that his armistice was regarded by his subjects as the outcome of treachery and cowardice, denounced it in March, 1849, and attacked Radetzky. The battle of Novara was the end of his hopes. He abdicated the throne and died heart-broken in Portugal a few months later, leaving his son Victor Emmanuel to grapple with the situation. By an adroit use of French influence and an agreement to abandon the democratic parties elsewhere, their ruler saved Piedmont from conquest. In spite of the most seductive offers he refused to modify his father's constitution, which remained as the nucleus of future Italian liberty. Meanwhile Naples, Spain, Austria, and France were anxious for the honour of restoring the Pope to his dominions, and the new Roman republic, in which Mazzini's influence was great, began to make such preparations as it could against the coming storm. On 25 April some 10,000 French troops under General Oudinot, the son of Napoleon's marshal, landed at Civita Vecchia. The French were agreed that Austria could not be allowed to monopolize the peninsula, and Louis Napoleon was dependent upon the support of the French catholic and clerical party,

European History

whose sympathies he could not better conciliate than by reopening the gates of Rome to Pius IX. The Roman republic was completely isolated; Austria was again supreme in northern Italy, and Britain was content merely to give advice to all parties, whether they asked for it or not.

Rome made a heroic if unavailing defence and the heroism was inspired by Garibaldi's presence within the walls. He was no statesman or diplomatist; "he had a heart of gold and the brains of an ox", said some of his adherents; but he was one of the finest guerrilla leaders known to history, and the personal magnetism which he exerted upon his followers was extraordinary. Many of the cosmopolitan crowd of artists who were then working in the Roman picture galleries fought bravely through the siege as much for personal love of Garibaldi as for love of the Roman republic.


These are the impressions of one of them:—

I had no idea of enlisting. I was a young artist; I only went out of curiosity—but, oh! I shall never forget that day when I saw him on his beautiful white horse in the market-place, with his noble aspect, his calm kind face, his high smooth forehead, his light hair and beard—everyone said the same. He reminded us of nothing so much as of our Saviour's head in the galleries. I could not resist him. I left my studio. I went after him; thousands did likewise. He had only to show himself. We all worshipped him; we could not help it.

A Dutch artist describes him as follows:—

Instinctively we looked round and Garibaldi entered through the gate. . . . Of middle height, well made, broad shouldered, his square chest which gives a sense of power to his structure, well marked under his uniform—he stood there before us; his blue eyes ranging to violet, surveyed in one glance the whole group. Those eyes had something remarkable, as well by the colour as by the frankness—I know no better word for it—of their expression. They contrasted curiously with those dark sparkling eyes of his Italian soldiers, no less than his light chestnut brown hair, which fell loosely over his neck upon his shoulders, contrasted with their shining black curls. . . . But most striking of all was the nose with its exceedingly broad root, which has caused Garibaldi to be given the name of *Leone*, and indeed made one think of a lion, a resemblance which, according to his soldiers, was still more conspicuous in the fight, when his eyes shot forth flames, and his fair hair waved as a mane above his temples.

The first French attack was repulsed with heavy loss, and Oudinot was obliged to await the arrival of reinforcements. Meanwhile Ferdinand II of Naples, who had earned the nickname of Bomba for his barbarous destruction of Messina by bombardment in September, 1848, had advanced to the frontier with 10,000 men. He enjoyed the confidence of the Pope, who mistrusted Oudinot, and the French were not only the diplomatic rivals of the Neapolitans, but also regarded them with supreme personal contempt. There was therefore no reason



{127}

m° Garibaldi

GARIBALDI
From a photograph by Brogi

to fear any concerted movement between the French and the Neapolitan forces. Garibaldi crossed the Campagna with some 2000 troops to hold the Neapolitans in check. He speedily displayed the utter incompetency of Ferdinand's troops, and inspired them with a wholesome terror of his name, before he was recalled to Rome. Negotiations with France had been in progress, but when Oudinot had received his desired reinforcements these were broken off and the conflict was resumed. After a series of desperate struggles the French succeeded in capturing the Villa Corsini, which commanded the Janiculum and was therefore the key to the whole position. The city was not reduced for another month, when many of the defences had been battered into heaps of rubble, and street fighting offered no prospect of success. Garibaldi proposed to leave Rome with those who cared to follow him, and some 4000 Italians started upon a wildly adventurous expedition which could advance to no point of safety, and retire upon no secure base. Some wished to avoid imprisonment, and then to reach their homes, while others hoped for plunder; many went because Garibaldi led them.

Garibaldi led his men northward in the attempt to reach Venice, which was still holding out against the Austrians. The skill with which he guided his little band through the heart of Italy, amid the French and Austrian troops, was a masterly achievement only made possible by his years of South American experience in the art of guerrilla warfare. From time to time his followers fell away as they reached their homes or saw an opportunity of concealment. Their weapons were lost, or concealed by patriots in the hope that they might be of use upon some future occasion. In the little republic of San Marino the weary band obtained a few days' rest, especially acceptable to Garibaldi's wife, who was in poor health. When they reached the Romagna, Garibaldi took to the sea with about 250 men, but his boats were overtaken by the Austrians and were driven to land or captured. The survivors scattered to seek safety as best they could. Garibaldi took refuge with his wife in the marshes near Ravenna. Her health had grown steadily worse, and she died before he could arrange any means for her removal. He himself was passed from hand to hand by patriots, who risked their lives in the endeavour, and at length succeeded in gaining the sea, whence he made his way to Piedmont. Venice and its heroic defender, Manin, were forced to surrender to the Austrians in September, 1849, and Austrian order was once more restored throughout the peninsula. The patriots, the demagogues, and the apostles of liberty who had preached and fought for weeks in Rome and other capitals were scattered abroad upon the face of the earth, languishing in prisons or gathering such scanty resources as they could with a view to emigration. The revolutions of 1848 and 1849 were over.

Garibaldi was not allowed to remain in Piedmont. After a short visit to Nice, where he saw his parents, he was at length able to settle at Tangier, where he remained until 1850 as the guest of the Pied-

montese consul. He had attempted, but in vain, to secure employment as a merchant captain, and in April, 1850, he embarked for North America by way of Liverpool. In America he was obliged to work at candle making in a small factory near New York. A merchant friend carried him off to Central America in 1851, and he was then able to visit the South American ports, where the Italian patriots gave him a warm welcome. In 1854 he sailed for Newcastle as captain of a small vessel, and was able to meet Mazzini in England. He spent more than a month with him in London, and there formed many of the friendships which afterwards bound him to England with deep and enduring affection. A strong pro-Italian feeling had gradually been growing in the country, and a great sensation had been made in 1850 when the Austrian general, Haynau, who was visiting England, made a tour of inspection of Barclay's brewery, and was assaulted by the workmen, who were indignant at the Austrian cruelty in Italy. In 1852 and 1853 a conspiracy had occurred at Mantua and a revolt had broken out at Milan, both of which were repressed by the Austrians with the usual series of floggings and executions. The idea began to gain ground that popular risings were a sheer waste of life, and the statesman Cavour was carefully fostering this idea with a view to gaining support for Victor Emmanuel and his monarchy as a nucleus of the future free Italy. In the spring of 1854 Garibaldi returned to Italy and settled down in Nice.

In Italy the man of the hour was now Cavour. The Bismarck of Italy and the real maker of the modern state, he was fully imbued with British political ideas regarding freely elected Parliaments as the essential basis of government. He differed, however, from Bismarck in his belief that it was possible, while governing through Parliament, to persuade the country to follow the course recommended by wisdom and experience, and he disregarded the outcries of interested factions and the selfish claims of people with axes of their own to grind. He was ready to expostulate with the despots of various states and to urge the adoption of more liberal forms of government. Piedmont was thus regarded as the centre of light and hope by every patriot who had any hope for his country. Numbers of exiles from other Italian states entered Piedmont, and, being as they were the pick of the country, proved a valuable accession of strength. The participation of Italy in the Crimean war was a burning question when Garibaldi returned to Nice. Many regarded the Italian share in the campaign as a waste of slender resources which ought to be hoarded for the coming struggle with Austria. But Cavour's object was to pave the way for an alliance with Napoleon III or with Britain against Austria, and though Garibaldi does not seem to have appreciated this policy he quite believed that every effort should be made to recall to the memories of European nations the fact that Italy was politically alive.

In 1855 the death of a brother left Garibaldi a small inheritance, with which he bought half of the island of Caprera, not far from


Sardinia and within easy reach of the little port of Maddalena. There he spent his time cultivating the ground, building his house, and watching events upon the continent, which he could easily reach whenever his presence might be required. For the moment the centre of interest had shifted from Piedmont to Naples. From 1821 to 1860 Naples lived under a police despotism, reinforced by the army, the priesthood, and by a host of spies, a rule embodied in the person of King Ferdinand II, known to Italian history as Bomba. Gifted with a liberal allowance of low cunning, he conceived that deceit and tyranny were the best instruments of government, nor had he ever known any others. Some germs of patriotism he seems to have possessed: he resented Austrian interference and rejected French and British overtures with no less impartiality. But while he thus maintained his own absolute power he made no attempt to reform the corruption by which the state was undermined, and though he had been forced to grant a constitution in 1848, this concession was speedily withdrawn. In the years immediately following, the prisons of Naples were filled with representatives of every shade of political opinion. Wealthy and leading citizens were forbidden to leave their houses without special police permits; men of refinement and literary taste were left to rot in loathsome dungeons, and a state of affairs existed which fully justified the fierce invective of Mr. Gladstone:

It is not mere imperfection, not corruption in low quarters, not occasional severity that I am about to describe. It is the incessant, systematic violation of the law by the power appointed to watch over and maintain it. It is the wholesale persecution of virtue when united with intelligence, operating upon such a scale that entire classes may with truth be said to be its object. It is the awful profanation of public religion by its notorious alliance in the governing powers with the violation of every moral law. It is the perfect prostitution of the judicial office; I have heard strong but too true expressions used, "this is the negation of God erected into a system of government".

Mr. Gladstone's letters crystallized British opinion upon the subject of Italy and roused a tremendous controversy. There is no doubt that his words were not too strong, and the fact that Britain and France were ready to consider the condition of the Neapolitan kingdom roused some hope among the oppressed. But their eyes were not all turned to the same quarter of the heavens. Cavour, with wonderful cleverness, had succeeded in uniting the Italian democratic party for the support of Piedmont, and among them was included Garibaldi, who publicly proclaimed that Victor Emmanuel's monarchy must be the basis of Italian unity. Mazzini's policy, which desired a temporary alliance with Piedmont against Austria and hoped for a future republic, was thus repudiated. The Italian National Society which was formed in 1857 was joined by thousands of Italians, who, though previously republicans, had been converted to Cavour's ideas. This statesman, therefore, was enabled to declare

his intentions in the south of the peninsula, and had succeeded in making an arrangement with Napoleon III of France in 1858. Napoleon was ready to protect the Pope, and had some idea of securing the throne of Naples for his kinsman, Lucien Murat; but if he broke definitely with Sardinia the prospects of a coalition against Austria would be ruined. On the other hand, Cavour's Neapolitan friends were able to help the movement by underground means. A series of small raids and risings placed the Sardinian Government in a difficult position. Cavour did not wish to offend Napoleon, nor, on the other hand, to lose the support of the Italian democrats. It was a position which seemed to become yet more difficult after the attempt made by Orsini, an ex-official of the Roman republic of 1849, to assassinate the Emperor Napoleon and the Empress Eugenie by means of explosive bombs on 14 January, 1858. Napoleon at first demanded that Piedmont should suppress the democrats and expel immigrants from her borders. Victor Emmanuel frankly declared his disavowal of the outrage and his friendly feelings for France, and, strangely enough, Napoleon was mollified to the point of befriending Italy and even his would-be murderer. To try to fathom the motives of Napoleon III is a hopeless task; combining as he did the selfishness of the scheming adventurer and the opportunist politician with the extravagance of an idealist believer in the principles of the French Revolution, he might have been swayed by any number of motives. Orsini was executed, but he wrote a letter to Napoleon appealing to him to free his country from Austria, a letter which was printed in all the newspapers and even read at the trial. Napoleon possibly remembered that Italy had been the scene of Bonaparte's first successes, and thought that history might be repeated in his own case.

The result was a meeting with Cavour at Plombières, in July, 1858. A quarrel was to be picked with Austria, after which the French and Italian troops would drive the Austrians out of the peninsula and dictate terms of peace at Vienna. Italy was to become a congeries of weak states under the nominal presidency of the Pope and the real suzerainty of France, while Savoy and Nice were to be ceded to France, and Sardinia was to be extended to include northern Italy. There were difficulties in the way of this scheme, the chief of which was the certain opposition of the Pope, whom Napoleon would not venture to offend, while the result of it would be merely to exchange Austrian for French supremacy. Cavour, however, considered that the change could not possibly be for the worse, and that Napoleon would be an easier incubus to throw off than Austria. Preparations were therefore made: patriots were smuggled to the north of Italy to swell the Piedmontese armies, while a policy of pinpricks was begun against Austria upon the question of enlisting Italian deserters from the Austrian provinces. War was declared in May, 1859, and Cavour had a terribly anxious time before this date was reached. The first hint of Napoleon's intentions roused a general outcry in France and Britain. Britain



MAZZINI

After the portrait by Henshaw



COUNT CAOUR

From the portrait in the Uffizi Gallery



VICTOR EMMANUEL II

From a photograph



NAPOLEON III

From the painting at Farnborough

thought that Italian grievances could be remedied without a general upheaval, and feared that war might be but the opening to another era of Napoleonic conquest. Napoleon quailed before the tumult, and attempted to negotiate for a general disarmament. Cavour was well aware that such an order in Italy would mean the overthrow of the house of Savoy; for a time he actually contemplated suicide, but Austria herself solved the difficulty. She declined to disarm, and ordered her troops to invade Piedmont on 27 April. Napoleon then came to the rescue of Piedmont and Cavour.

Cavour had already arranged that Garibaldi should play a certain part in the operations. His old warriors rallied round him, in particular his right-hand man, Nino Bixio. Garibaldi was commissioned to organize a force which was to operate in the Alps, and though want of governmental organization deprived his troops of proper transport and munitions of war, the skill of their leader and their own enthusiasm enabled them to perform every demand that was laid upon them. Garibaldi was able to drive the Austrians from Lake Como, when he heard the news of Magenta. He harried the Austrians on their retreat to the Quadrilateral, but was not allowed to share in the great battle of Solferino, the second defeat of the Austrians. He and his force, much to their regret, were sent into the Valtelline to guard the Stelvio Pass. But with 3000 young volunteers, armed with old muskets and without artillery, he had succeeded in drawing away over 11,000 men from the Austrian main body, and inflicting defeats upon them in spite of their infinitely superior equipment.

An announcement was then made which roused Italian patriots throughout the peninsula to fury. Napoleon concluded peace with the Austrian emperor at Villafranca on 11 July, 1859. He probably had no choice in the matter. Prussia and other German states were alarmed at the possible aggrandizement of France, and Napoleon himself must have seen that the movement for Italian unity was rapidly growing. He knew that a single defeat might mean for him the loss of his throne, and his nerve seems to have been shaken by the slaughter which he had witnessed at Magenta and Solferino. Cavour, however, felt that he had been deceived, and was justly indignant. By the terms of peace, Austria was left in possession of such Venetian territory as her army still occupied, while the former despots in Tuscany and the Papal states were to be restored. Piedmont might have accepted these terms, and would have gained Lombardy as the price, but never again would she have had the opportunity of leading a patriotic movement towards Italian unity. Of this fact Cavour was well aware, and advised Victor Emmanuel to reject the treaty and continue the struggle alone. He wished him to abdicate, as his father had done, for the purpose of demonstrating to humanity the treachery and injustice of Napoleon. In conversation with the Senator Joachim Pietri, an intimate friend of Napoleon, Cavour showed a fury that astonished those who had seen in him nothing but the quiet and calculating diplomatist. "Your emperor has insulted me," he shouted; "yes, sir, insulted me!"

He gave me his word, and promised me to relax no efforts until the Austrians were completely driven out of Italy. He stipulated for Nice and Savoy as his reward. I induced my sovereign to consent to this sacrifice for the sake of Italy. My king, my good and honourable king, trusted me and consented. Your emperor now pockets his reward and lets us shift for ourselves. I am dishonoured before my king. But this peace will lead to nothing; this treaty shall not be carried out."

Victor Emmanuel, however, realized that Napoleon had risked a great deal for the sake of Italy, and consented to the peace with the reservation that it was binding only upon himself and his own territories, and did not oblige him to restore the former Governments in the revolted provinces. These provinces were ready to fight rather than to return to their former condition. Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the Romagna prepared to retain their independence until Piedmont could venture to annex them as they desired. A league was formed between them, the forces of which were placed under the command of one Fanti, who named Garibaldi as his lieutenant. Garibaldi brought large numbers of his volunteers with him, and his impetuous troops were prepared to attack the Papal provinces or to march in any other direction. This would have been sheer madness until the French armies were withdrawn from Lombardy and Victor Emmanuel stepped in at the right moment and persuaded Garibaldi to resign his command. Piedmont must be able to annex the northern provinces with the southern, but the right base for an attack upon Naples was Sicily and not the north, and the right year was not 1859.

Meanwhile Cavour had retired for a time, and was succeeded by one Rattazzi, a more tractable and in some respects a more acceptable politician to Victor Emmanuel at the moment. By the end of the year 1859 Napoleon began to understand that an attempt to carry out his programme in central Italy would expose him to the risk of losing Savoy and Nice. Interest and inclination alike urged him to leave Piedmont in possession of the central Italian provinces. On the other hand, the definite concession of Savoy and Nice was necessary, and for this purpose Victor Emmanuel was obliged to recall Cavour to office. Pius IX naturally regarded Napoleon's change of policy with the utmost disfavour. But his own unwillingness to break with the feudal and mediaeval principles upon which his states had been previously governed left him no real ground for criticism. If the Pope required a secular kingdom to maintain his independence, a smaller territory would suffice for that purpose; at the same time Napoleon was by no means certain what precise accession of territory Sardinia was to receive, and thought that Tuscany should at least remain independent. Cavour, however, on his own initiative, took a referendum early in 1860 from all the central Italian provinces, on the question whether they wished for incorporation in the kingdom of Italy. There was no doubt about the answer, and Cavour had already secured the moral support of Britain, which was quite pre-

pared to see Italy withdrawn from French influence. Cavour then opened negotiations concerning the cession of Savoy and Nice; the emperor would not risk the loss of these two provinces for the sake of possible openings in Italy. On the other hand, the cession of Nice roused strong opposition in the Piedmontese Government: Garibaldi took his seat in Parliament for the express purpose of opposing the idea. The treaty, however, was signed on 24 March, 1860, and Cavour earned the hatred of Garibaldi, who declared that the minister had made him an alien in his own country. The deception perhaps rankled more deeply than the loss of territory, for Cavour, a year previously, had denied the existence of any intention to abandon Nice, and when Victor Emmanuel explained to Garibaldi that he should be as ready to yield Nice as the crown of Sardinia was ready to yield Savoy in the cause of Italian unity, the objections of the great patriot were at once disarmed. The story that Cavour sent a note to Garibaldi in order to soothe his feelings, with the brief question: "Nice or Sicily?" is probably apocryphal; it was not thus that a statesman like Cavour would have incited Garibaldi to undertake so desperate a venture. "We must first organize ourselves," he said, "form a powerful army, and then we can turn our eyes to Venice and to Rome and the South."

The South, however, was not inclined to wait. The despotism of Ferdinand II had long been rousing a storm which was about to burst. And in Sicily especially subterranean intrigues, for which the people had an innate aptitude, had completely undermined the official Government. In 1859 Sicilian conspirators had invited Garibaldi to come and lead them. With sound sense he advised them to strengthen themselves and support Victor Emmanuel in Italy. An abortive revolt took place in Palermo in March, 1860. Though the forces were scattered by the Bourbon troops, the leaders were able to keep the embers of the conspiracy alive by spreading reports that Garibaldi was coming. During the last days of 1859 he was actually considering the question and his fellow conspirators were buying rifles. He hesitated, however, in view of the fact that all the former plots against the Bourbons had miscarried, and he desired a definite statement from Mazzini and his party, who had engineered the conspiracy, that the struggle should be waged for Italy and Victor Emmanuel and not in some vague hopes of republicanism. Ferdinand II died in May, 1859, and had been succeeded by Francis II, a feeble pietist with no mind of his own. The Neapolitan army was certainly considerable in numbers, but the observation of Ferdinand II, when he found his son studying a new uniform for his troops, throws a lurid light upon their efficiency. "Dress them how you please," said the old king cheerfully, "they will run away all the same." After an infinite amount of intrigue and diplomacy Garibaldi at length resolved to start on 5 May, 1860. Cavour feared French and Austrian interference, and doubted whether the insurrectionists would have the vigour or tenacity to carry their undertaking through. On the other hand, if Garibaldi succeeded in conquering the island and

gaining a footing on the peninsula, Italian deliverance seemed certain, and the general enthusiasm in the country made it seem much more dangerous to stop the expedition than to allow it to start. Eventually it was resolved that Garibaldi should be allowed to go, though he naturally went without official countenance.

Of all the filibustering expeditions undertaken by land or sea, that of Garibaldi and the Thousand appears the most wildly impossible and extravagant enterprise. Palermo itself, the main object of the attack, was garrisoned with 20,000 well-armed Neapolitan troops. Neapolitan ships of war were known to be in the neighbourhood of the island. Though it was hoped that the inhabitants would rise upon Garibaldi's arrival, the Neapolitans were notoriously untrustworthy and liable to attacks of panic. Yet Garibaldi set out from Genoa with 1150 men crammed into two little steamers, armed for the most part with obsolete muskets, supported by a few ancient cannon, and unprovided with ammunition of any kind. He had been unable to pick up certain stores at sea upon the moment of his departure, and was forced to secure some ammunition upon his way by a stratagem. His volunteers were composed of all classes and conditions of men, many of them university students, others of them doctors, lawyers, or artisans. Most of them, however, had seen fire before, and all were under the strong discipline which Garibaldi invariably maintained. His lieutenant and right-hand man, Nino Bixio, was by his own authority strong enough to control even so heterogeneous a troop. Bixio's speech to the men at the first sign of insurrection is a better commentary upon his character than any number of descriptive pages: "I command here; I am everything; I am Tsar, Sultan, and Pope. I am Nino Bixio. I must be obeyed like God. If you dare to shrug your shoulders or think of mutiny, I will come along with a sabre and cut you in pieces." Thus the expedition set sail for Sicily, and such patriots as were not prostrated with seasickness occupied the voyage with the manufacture of cartridges.

Meanwhile Cavour was in a painfully anxious situation. While Garibaldi was still at sea, Russia and Prussia both protested against the expedition. Austria and Britain held aloof, but the attitude of France was menacing and uncertain. Napoleon was apparently unable to decide whether he should protect the Neapolitan Government against the movement for reform or whether he should secure its overthrow in the interests of France. At any rate, on 7 May, Cavour received a threatening letter of expostulation and a refusal to withdraw any French troops from Rome. Cavour telegraphed orders to his admiral that Garibaldi was to be stopped if he was encountered at sea. The telegram was intended, no doubt, to save his own credit in the case of failure, and the admiral, who was more than half aware of Cavour's position, was unlikely to make any effort for the arrest of Garibaldi. Nor would public opinion in northern Italy have allowed Cavour to recall the expedition.

Upon 11 May Garibaldi sighted the port of Marsala, the Lilybæum

of the ancients, and disembarked without delay. Only the presence of certain British warships enabled him to carry out this operation unmolested. The Neapolitan ships appeared in the offing too late to stop the Thousand, but in time to have destroyed the expedition if they had opened fire upon the disembarkation. They had, however, more than a suspicion that the British commanders were prepared to interfere, a suspicion grounded upon the fact that British cruisers had been constantly seen in Sicilian waters. After they had exchanged *pour-parlers* with the British captains, and had decided to open fire, Garibaldi and his men were safe within the walls of Marsala. Garibaldi then resolved to make his way to Salemi, the nearest mountain town, to rest his men and gather round him as many of the inhabitants as could be persuaded to rise. He would thence march upon Palermo, and by 13 May he had successfully avoided the Neapolitan troops and established himself at his first halting place. Meanwhile the Neapolitan detachment under General Landi had moved to Calatafimi, and by the morning of 15 May the general heard that Garibaldi's force was advancing against him. Garibaldi was supported by about 8000 native troops, who proved perfectly useless when the battle began. The conflict itself was confined to the operation of storming the hill which the Neapolitans held. Garibaldi's artillery was of no use for clearing the way, and the Neapolitans were armed with the best rifles of the period, and had every advantage of position. Fortunately for the attacking party the hill had been terraced for agricultural purposes, and under the shelter of the terrace walls the Thousand were able to snatch moments for breath and shelter during the progress of the assault. Garibaldi succeeded in collecting some 400 men under the last terrace, and a final rush cleared the Neapolitans from the summit. The Thousand lost some 150 killed and wounded, the enemy probably less; but though the battle may be described as nothing more than an unimportant skirmish, the moral effects were tremendous. Garibaldi was a name to conjure with in the island. Tales had been told of him for years in every Neapolitan barrack-room, and the Neapolitan troops now lost all cohesion and retired precipitately upon Palermo, where General Lanza, who had been placed in command, appeared just in time to witness their arrival.

In Palermo everything was in readiness as far as readiness was possible for so unpractical a people as the Neapolitans. In one respect they could, however, be fully trusted—in their capacity for intrigue. It was generally known throughout the city that Garibaldi proposed to attack upon the morning of 27 May, and the secret was well kept from the Neapolitan officers and men. Garibaldi was met with some resistance upon approaching the town, from Neapolitan riflemen, but a determined rush carried himself and his troops within the city, and days of street fighting then began, in which the Thousand and the inhabitants gradually drove the royalist troops towards the sea. The situation from time to time appeared desperate. The Sicilian allies were occasionally seized with fits of lethargy, and desired to desert; the

ammunition ran short. But when Garibaldi succeeded in commanding the cathedral and the centre of the town General Lanza proposed an armistice. To this Garibaldi readily agreed; it is doubtful whether he could have continued the struggle for another day. The enemy, however, were by no means aware of his position, and a second armistice was concluded on the following day, after which Lanza agreed to evacuate the town. Twelve days were expended in the task of embarking the army of 20,000 men; by 19 June the last of them were gone. Meanwhile the rebellion had blazed up throughout the island, and other scattered garrisons of the royalists were hard pressed, especially in Messina.


These events inspired King Francis of Naples with the liveliest alarm. He summoned liberal ministers to office, promised the Neapolitans a free constitution, and begged Napoleon to help him. The latter, however, explained to the envoys that, while he had every reason to desire a continuance of the kingdom of Naples, he did not feel able to oppose the popular movement. He advised the king of Naples to abandon Sicily and to make overtures to King Victor Emmanuel, which he promised to support with his influence. The Great Powers, including even Britain, were still of the opinion that two kingdoms could coexist in Italy. Cavour was therefore placed in a difficult position. To turn his back upon the overtures of France would be to defy Europe; to countenance any steps for maintaining the hated Bourbons in power might imperil the whole structure which he had so laboriously raised. However, he opened negotiations as a matter of form, and persuaded his king to write to Garibaldi and to request him to stop the landing of troops upon Italian soil. Garibaldi declined to listen. "Your Majesty", he replied, "is aware of the high respect and affection which I entertain for your person, but the state of affairs in Italy does not allow me to obey you as I should wish. Permit me, then, on this occasion to be disobedient. As soon as I have accomplished my duty, and the people are freed from their detested yoke, I will lay my sword at your feet, and obey you for the rest of my life." The influence of Mazzini's party, however, added to Cavour's anxieties. They had surrounded Garibaldi's party in Italy, and it seemed that if republicanism gained the upper hand the unity of Italy was a lost ideal. While, therefore, negotiations were proceeding with Naples, Cavour did his best to provoke a revolution, with the object of securing the proclamation of the king himself as dictator. This intrigue, however, was a failure. The ministers whom Cavour hoped to utilize as his tools were suspected by the Bourbon Government, and were driven to take refuge in Piedmont. It was obvious that Garibaldi must overthrow the Bourbons in Italy as he had overthrown them in Sicily.

He landed on the peninsula near Melito on 19 August, 186*1*, and marched upon Naples. He was received everywhere with tumultuous enthusiasm. On 7 September he was able to enter Naples with 18,000 volunteers, whereupon the king withdrew to a strong fortress on the

1860

DRAWING FOR MILITARY SERVICE —
MODERN ITALY. From a painting by F. W. W.
Topham, R.I., in the Manchester Whitworth Institute.

The painting here reproduced shows the conscriptionist basis of the present Italian army, which stands in sharp contrast to the volunteer troops by which Garibaldi won the freedom of his country. The painter of this picture, Frank W. W. Topham, R.I., was the son of an artist, F. W. Topham, R.W.S., and was born in 1838 in London. This is one of the most successful of his works.



DRAWING FOR MILITARY SERVICE—MODERN ITALY

F. W. W. TOPHAM, R.I.

Volturno with an army of 60,000 men. Mazzini's party were beside themselves with joy; not only were the French to be driven from Rome and the Austrians from Venice, but a campaign had been started which was to liberate Hungary, restore the independence of Poland, and secure the triumph of democracy throughout Europe. For this purpose they were anxious to prevent the inhabitants of Naples from conducting a plebiscite upon the question whether they wished Victor Emmanuel to be their king. They persuaded Garibaldi to march upon Rome and to drive out the French troops, and Garibaldi was ready to listen, being fully persuaded that any reluctance on the part of Victor Emmanuel to countenance such a move was inspired only by the jealousy of Cavour. He ordered the expulsion from Sicily of Cavour's envoys, the king's nominee for the dictatorship was replaced by a prominent member of Mazzini's party, and there seemed every probability of a war with Austria and France.

Cavour resolved to intervene at once and with decision. He was convinced that a revolutionary movement could only succeed if it were guided by the constitutional monarchy of northern Italy. He therefore advised the king to invade the Papal territory of Umbria and the Marches with the exception of Rome, which was protected by Napoleon, and to attack the army of the Bourbons. The Pope had collected an army of 20,000 mercenaries under the command of General de Lamoricière, a prominent member of the French legitimist party. A large number of the officers were also legitimists, a fact which did not tend to prepossess Napoleon in their favour. The Sardinian Government was thus afforded a good excuse for the invasion. Lamoricière was defeated on 18 September, at Castelfidardo, and almost the whole of the Papal army was taken prisoner. Garibaldi's attempt upon the Volturno had proved unsuccessful. The Bourbon troops repulsed his attack and crossed the river in turn, but the situation was relieved by the appearance of Victor Emmanuel's army, upon which the Neapolitans withdrew. Garibaldi was now completely under the influence of Mazzini's party and of the opponents of Cavour. He strongly objected to the incorporation of Naples and Sicily in the kingdom of Italy, and actually informed the king that he would not consent to any proposal of the kind unless Cavour and his party were dismissed from office. But upon this occasion he was not supported by public opinion. Every thinking man was anxious for a rapid union with the northern monarchy. The recent convulsions had thrown the south of Sicily in particular into hopeless confusion. After long hesitation Garibaldi resolved to yield. A plebiscite was taken, and Umbria, the Marches, Naples, and Sicily voted almost unanimously for annexation to the Sardinian kingdom in the month of October. The king was prepared to nominate Garibaldi as lieutenant-general of the districts which he had conquered, had the patriot not laid down as an indispensable condition that he should receive permission to march upon Rome in the following spring. A breach with France was not to be thought of, and Garibaldi therefore withdrew in mortified dignity to his rocky

island of Caprera, convinced that Cavour was the real obstacle in his way. In a final manifesto he expressed his hope that a million Italians would join him in the spring for the purpose of liberating Rome and Venice. Cavour's judgment, however, was entirely correct. When Garibaldi proposed to march upon Rome, Napoleon informed the Vienna Government that he would not oppose armed interference in Italy by Austria on behalf of the Papacy, though he could not countenance any further disturbance of Lombardy.

The Neapolitan army was unable to stand against Victor Emmanuel's troops, and King Francis retired to the fortress of Gaeta, which was captured, after a long siege, on 13 February, 1861. The unification of Italy was now within sight, but the statesman who had worked with indomitable perseverance to attain this end was not to see the fulfilment of his wishes. The first Italian Parliament assembled in Turin in February, and conferred upon Victor Emmanuel the title of king of Italy, though Venice and Rome were still in foreign hands. Cavour died on 6 June, 1861, worn out with toil and anxiety. He had been bitterly upbraided by Garibaldi in the Parliament; he probably longed as much as Garibaldi himself to attack Rome and Venice, but his statesmanlike foresight saw that the time was not yet. He died as an orthodox Catholic, murmuring the words: "A free Church in a free State", and he must have realized with proud satisfaction the fact that within ten short years of office his energy had given Italy union and independence.

During the last month of Cavour's life his attention had been particularly occupied by the Roman question. A number of his friends considered that the Pope should be left in undisturbed possession of Rome, as a free state in which he might reside as a protector and suzerain. Cavour was convinced that Italian unity was impossible unless the country was in possession of its natural capital. Pius IX, a simple childlike character, was entirely under the influence of his advisers, and their obstinacy proved a great obstacle to the final union of Italy. Cavour's successor, Ricasoli, proposed a treaty securing the Papacy in all its secular rights, and offering the renunciation by the king of all his rights of investiture provided that the Pope would recognize the *status quo*. If the treaty had been carried out the Pope would have been complete master of the Italian Church, but the proposal was rejected and the ministry of Ricasoli was overthrown in consequence. Under his successor, Rattazzi, Garibaldi twice raised an army of volunteers to seize the city for Italy, but the French emperor informed Victor Emmanuel that France would hold Italy responsible for Garibaldi's actions. The king was therefore obliged to oppose him by force, and at the battle of Aspromonte, on 29 August, 1862, he was wounded and obliged to lay down his arms. A similar attempt in 1867 was defeated by the Papal troops and the French at Mentana. Nor was it until the end of the Franco-Prussian war that the road to Rome was thrown open.

Venice was added to the kingdom in 1866. Victor Emmanuel

formed an alliance with Prussia upon the outbreak of the war with Austria, upon the condition that no peace should be made with Austria until Venice had been ceded to Italy. Prussia, again, helped indirectly to add Rome to the Italian dominions. After the overthrow of the French empire, Victor Emmanuel was informed by the republican government that France would no longer support the Papal power. The Italian Government immediately gave notice to the Pope that Rome would be incorporated in the kingdom of Italy, and the city voted by a hundred to one for annexation. In 1871 Victor Emmanuel was able to take up his official residence in the Eternal City, which then became the capital of a free and united Italy. Garibaldi's work had been finished long before. In 1870 he fought on the side of the French against the Prussians with a band of volunteers; but he was no longer the man he had been, and after the defeat of Bourbaki he returned to Caprera, where he died on 2 June, 1882. His career reached its zenith with his capture of Naples, and there is little doubt that this result would never have been achieved with such rapidity had it not been for his magnetic influence and striking personality. For diplomacy he had little or no talent; as a guerrilla warrior he was unsurpassed, but the most extraordinary feature of his character is the enthusiasm which he was capable of inspiring for the cause which he had at heart. Men were attracted to his banner who had seen him but once, and for an instant, in their lives, and many to whom he never even spoke were ready to die for him. The ultimate liberation of Italy was largely due to the fact that so powerful an influence was forthcoming to support her cause when the hour for action struck.

EPILOGUE

THE BALANCE OF POWER AND THE GREAT EUROPEAN WAR

The foundation of the German Empire in 1871 marks the beginning of a new era in the political history of Europe. The solution of the age-long problem of the German states by their close federation under the leadership of Prussia was an economic gain to Europe, and this great achievement gives Bismarck a secure place among creative statesmen, whatever views may be held regarding his methods. The Empire once established, Bismarck devoted all his unrivalled statecraft to securing its permanence and stability both internally and externally. Its internal progress—industrial, commercial, educational, and socio-political—has been one of the outstanding features of recent European history, but does not concern us here, save as providing the necessary basis for enabling Germany to claim a commanding place in the states system of Europe. Bismarck's foreign policy aimed at two objects—the isolation and crippling of France and friendship with Russia—and he feared above all a combination of France and Russia against Germany. As long as he was responsible for the policy of the Empire, no such hostile combination was accomplished, but five years after his dismissal from office in 1890 it was complete. Five years after his death France found another friend in Britain, and four years later the Triple Entente was rounded off by an agreement between Britain and Russia. At the same time Bismarck's one enduring achievement in foreign policy, the Triple Alliance, in spite of periodical renewals, was steadily weakening through the gradual *rapprochement* between Italy and France and the revival of Italy's historic antipathy to Austria. The result has been the virtual isolation of Germany, except for the alliance of the German-Magyar-Slav Empire of Austria-Hungary, and to-day Germany is fighting for existence against an overwhelming European combination.

Built up by means of three wars, against Denmark, Austria, and France respectively, the German Empire, despite its great progress in the arts of peace and its magnificent contributions to civilization, has been so militarist in its character as to be regarded by other Powers as a menace to their independence and integrity. Bismarck's successors have continued the spirit of his policy without his skill and often with amazing folly, and the result has been to shake to its foundations the

Epilogue

great structure that he reared. It would have been well for Germany if there had been, both in the making of the Empire and in its subsequent government, less of the "mailed fist" and of Machiavellian diplomacy and more of the spirit of conciliation and accommodation.

THE THREE EMPERORS' ENTENTE, 1872.—The first stage in Bismarck's foreign policy was marked by the Three Emperors' Entente, an unwritten understanding arrived at in September, 1872, at a meeting in Berlin of the German, Austrian, and Russian emperors, William I, Francis Joseph, and Alexander II. Bismarck had helped Russia to suppress the Polish rebellion in 1863, when Napoleon III was inclined, though unable, to help the Poles, and had thus gained her benevolent neutrality in his empire-building wars. It was therefore easy for him to maintain relations of friendship with Russia, and the Balkan question had not yet reached the stage when the rivalry of Russia and Austria was to render it impossible to be an ally of both. The fear of Nihilism, Socialism, and revolutionary movements generally was used by Bismarck to draw the three Empires together. It is said that Bismarck almost simultaneously concluded a secret agreement with Austria alone, promising to support her in obtaining compensation for her losses of territory in the wars of 1859 and 1866—an arrangement of considerable significance in connection with the Bosnian question in 1878, 1908-9, and 1914. The same year is said to have witnessed the conclusion of a secret defensive convention between Germany and Russia. In this way Bismarck endeavoured to insure Germany against the feared instability of the Three Emperors' Entente.

THE CRISIS OF 1875.—The victorious Germans thought that France was hopelessly crippled by military disaster and by the burden of the heavy indemnity, but the French nation, under the skilful guidance of Thiers, rose superior to disaster, and by heroic exertions completed the payment of the indemnity in 1873. The German troops finally evacuated the country in that year, and France set to work to organize its government and re-create its army. The rapid recuperation was regarded with open suspicion by German Chauvinists, as involving danger to Germany, and a serious crisis in the relations of the two countries was occasioned by a French military law of 1875. Bismarck is believed to have associated himself with the demand of influential people at the Berlin court for immediate war with France, and an inspired article entitled "War in Sight" appeared in the *Berlin Post* of 15 April, 1875. The facts as ascertained by the French Government were placed at the disposal of the *London Times* and published on 4 May. France appealed to Russia, and the Tsar Alexander II, on a visit to the Emperor William, used his influence against the mad and iniquitous design of "bleeding France white". Queen Victoria also helped the cause of peace by a personal letter to the German Emperor.

THE AUSTRO-GERMAN ALLIANCE, 1879.—The breach in the Three Emperors' Entente due to Russian action in the affair of 1875, prepared the way for the complete collapse of the agreement in consequence of the events that took place in the Balkans in 1875-8. A

revolt of the Christians of Herzegovina against the Turkish Government in 1875, followed by the Bulgarian atrocities of 1876, set the Balkan lands afame, and Servia and Montenegro declared war against Turkey in the middle of the latter year. At first the three Empires tried to act together and gain the co-operation of the other Powers in putting pressure upon Turkey to grant reforms, but the dissent of the British Government made a European settlement impossible, and Austria and Russia, as the Powers more immediately affected, came to a private arrangement at Reichstadt, on 8 July, 1876, in view of the possibility of Russian military intervention. This arrangement was embodied in a more precise treaty, concluded at Vienna on 15 January, 1877; but immediately afterwards it was found possible to get all the Powers to co-operate in a belated Protocol to Turkey. The failure of this Protocol led to Russia's declaration of war against Turkey on 24 April. The completeness of the Russian victory in the war aroused the fears of Austria lest her interests in the Balkans should be overlooked, and she proposed that the preliminaries of peace between Russia and Turkey, concluded at Adrianople, should be submitted to a European Conference. Backed by Britain—which had made warlike preparations—France, Italy, and Germany, her proposal for a European settlement was accepted by Russia, and the Balkan settlement made between Russia and Turkey in the treaty of San Stefano on 3 March, 1878, was submitted to European review and radically modified at Berlin in June-July, 1878.

The Treaty of Berlin, signed on 13 July, 1878, remade the map of the Balkan region, and the course of events that culminated in it profoundly modified the diplomatic relations of the European Powers. Russia and Austria were alienated from each other, and Russia was angry with Germany for thwarting her plans, as she thought, although Bismarck maintained that he had been simply an "honest broker", and had done his best for her. Bismarck had helped Austria to get compensation for her earlier losses by obtaining administrative occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The basis of the Three Emperors' Entente was destroyed, and the way prepared for a closer alliance between Germany and Austria. This was accomplished in October, 1879, after a meeting between Bismarck and Andrassy, the Austrian Chancellor, in August, at Gastein, in the crownland of Salzburg, a place associated with the fateful convention of 1865 between Prussia and Austria, which issued in the war of 1866. Each Power undertook to support the other in the event of attack by Russia, and to remain neutral in the event of attack by another Power, France being the potential aggressor in Bismarck's mind. This Alliance, which is at once the origin and the most solid link of the Triple Alliance, was kept secret until the spring of 1888, but the Emperor William I communicated its substance to the Tsar.

THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE, 1882.—The Austro-German Alliance of 1879 expanded into the Triple Alliance in May, 1882, by the adhesion of Italy through secret treaties with the two central Empires. Italy's

Epilogue

adhesion has always been somewhat of an anomaly in European politics, because of her historic antipathy to Austria, and when the hour of trial came in 1914 it was found that she felt herself free to maintain neutrality while Germany and Austria were fighting a strong European combination. Her traditional and unbroken friendship with Britain was a more solid fact than her uneasy alliance with the central Powers, and her Latin sympathies drew her more and more closely to France when the special causes of quarrel had become things of the past. A growing interest in Balkan affairs, moreover, has begun to drive a new wedge between her and Austria.

The original causes of her adhesion to the Triple Alliance were two—namely, fear of clericalism and anger at the French virtual annexation of Tunis in 1881. The standing quarrel between the Vatican and the Quirinal and the machinations of Jesuits and other clerics endangered the existence of the Italian kingdom, and it was natural that Italy should seek to ensure herself against this danger by coming to an understanding with Powers strong enough to protect her. She cherished the desire to become an effective force in Mediterranean politics by the acquisition of territory in North Africa, and had especially marked out Tunis as her share. When France established a protectorate there in 1881, following upon a punitive expedition against a Berber tribe, her anger knew no bounds. She appealed to Bismarck, but in vain, for he had already given his secret acquiescence in French designs. Britain, too, could not help her, because French acquiescence in the Cyprus convention, which had been concluded between Britain and Turkey on the eve of the Berlin Congress, had been purchased by giving her a free hand in Tunis. A sense of impotence drove Italy into the arms of the Central Powers, and the Triple Alliance was completed. This Alliance has been continued periodically for definite terms of years, and modifications appear to have been made in it at several of these renewals. The dates of renewal have been 1887, 1891, 1902, and 1913.

THE THREE EMPERORS' ENTENTE REVIVED, 1884.—Even after the completion of the Triple Alliance, Bismarck did not abandon the policy of alliance with Russia as a means of ensuring the safety of the German Empire. At a meeting of William I, Francis Joseph, and Alexander III, which took place in September, 1884, at Skieriewice, in Russian Poland, a secret treaty was concluded between the three Empires, but on its expiry in 1887 it was not renewed. In the year of the Skieriewice treaty Bismarck was converted to the policy of colonial expansion, and took steps to secure colonies in west, southwest, and east Africa. Colonial ambition became henceforward a dominant motive in German policy.

THE DUAL ALLIANCE, 1895.—The great counterpoise of the Triple Alliance in recent European history was the Triple Entente, a much looser, but, as events have shown, a more effective combination. The first stage in the making of the Triple Entente was marked by the conclusion of the secret Dual Alliance between France and

Russia. The fear of such a combination always haunted Bismarck; and even before his dismissal from office in 1890 by William II, the bombastic grandson of William I, the first steps towards it were taken. In 1888 France for the first time accommodated the Russian Government with a large loan, and this financial bond between the two nations has been ever since the strongest link in the chain of the Dual Alliance. In 1891 the French Channel Fleet visited the Russian naval port of Kronstadt and met with an enthusiastic reception. This visit was reciprocated in 1893 by that of a Russian squadron to Toulon, the delay having been due to the Panama scandals in France. A military convention seems to have been concluded between the two Governments in 1894, but the definite alliance appears to date from 1895. The French Prime Minister, M. Ribot, referred publicly to Russia as "*notre allié*" on 10 June, 1895. The Tsar Nicholas II visited Paris in 1896, and the French President, Félix Faure, returned the visit in the following year. On both these occasions very pointed reference was made to the alliance of the two states. The terms of the treaty of alliance have remained secret, but it is supposed that it provides for mutual military and naval support in case of attack by another Power, and it is understood to have no time limit. It almost certainly relates to European questions only. When Germany declared war against Russia in 1914 she immediately began military operations against France, being evidently satisfied that France must join Russia under the Dual Alliance treaty.

NAVAL RIVALRY.—The period, 1887–97, during which France and Russia were drawing together in the Dual Alliance, was characterized by the beginning of the intense naval rivalry which has burdened all the great Powers of Europe for so long. An agitation in Britain in the late eighties led to a large programme of new naval construction, and on the Continent France and Russia steadily added to their naval strength. For long Britain was regarded as building against a Franco-Russian combination, and the Two-power Standard was the guiding principle of her constructive programme. The modern German Navy, which has been regarded as the chief potential enemy of the British fleet since 1907 or 1908, came into being under the navy laws of 1898 and 1900, the latter being much the more important of the two. The keen rivalry between Britain and Germany in naval construction, with its attendant alienation of the two states in foreign policy, dates roughly from the German navy law of 1908, which caused a naval scare in Britain in 1909. The German Navy depends very largely upon the Kaiser Wilhelm Canal, which was constructed primarily for commercial purposes in 1887–95 to connect the North Sea with the Baltic. This canal was deepened and widened at the bottom by the middle of 1914, mainly for naval reasons.

BRITISH ISOLATION, 1895–1904.—During the period between the completion of the Dual Alliance in 1895 and the conclusion of the Franco-British agreement in 1904, Britain was isolated in European politics, and her official relations with several of the great European

Epilogue

states were at times far from friendly. The most serious crisis was that arising out of the Fashoda incident of 1898, which brought Britain and France to the verge of war. When Sir Horatio Kitchener (now Earl Kitchener) had reconquered the Upper Nile valley from the Khalifa, he found a French explorer, Major Marchand, on a semi-official mission in occupation of the post of Fashoda. He claimed the Upper Nile valley for Britain and Egypt, and after negotiations the French Government gave way, and recalled its agent. The South African War of 1899–1902 made Britain very unpopular on the Continent, but fortunately no European complications resulted. The danger of isolation had been revealed by the war, and the way prepared for a permanent Franco-British reconciliation. During this period the relations of France and Italy steadily improved, to the ultimate detriment of the Triple Alliance. A commercial treaty in 1898 ended the ten years' tariff war between these two countries, and a political agreement in 1901 removed other causes of friction. The visit of the King and Queen of Italy to Paris in October, 1903, and the return visit of the French President, Émile Loubet, to Rome, in April, 1904, established a cordial understanding between the two countries. A protest by the Pope against the latter visit led to the withdrawal of the French ambassador from the Vatican.

THE FRANCO-BRITISH ENTENTE, 1904.—The *entente cordiale* between Britain and France was prepared in 1903, by exchanges of courtesies which evoked popular demonstrations that showed how completely Fashoda and the policy of pin-pricks had been left behind. King Edward visited Paris in May and received a welcome such as only Parisians can give. President Loubet came to London in July, and London vied with Paris in its enthusiasm. Members of the two legislatures exchanged visits and fraternized in the most cordial way; Chambers of Commerce, municipal bodies, co-operative societies, trade unions, and other organizations contributed to the growing friendship of the Liberal Western Powers; and on 14 October the first formal step in the new international amity was taken, when a treaty of arbitration and conciliation was signed on behalf of the two Governments. During this period of increasing mutual goodwill delicate negotiations were in progress, and on 8 April, 1904, the historic and far-reaching Franco-British agreement was signed.

Under this agreement all outstanding questions between Britain and France were amicably settled. The agreement comprised a convention under which France abandoned her claims of certain fishing rights in Newfoundland in return for certain territorial adjustments in West Africa; a declaration by which France recognized the permanence of the British occupation of Egypt in return for British recognition of French special interests in Morocco; and a declaration regarding outstanding vexed questions in Siam, Madagascar, and the New Hebrides. This agreement is the most notable example in recent history of the removal of a whole host of possible *casus belli* by a businesslike arrangement in a spirit of goodwill. The gain to both countries, material and moral, has been incalculable, and European

civilization has benefited by the termination of an age-long rivalry. The fear that Britain was committed to armed support of France by secret articles of the agreement was dispelled by the publication of all the secret articles on 24 November, 1911.

Further light was thrown upon British relations with France by Sir Edward Grey's speech in the House of Commons on 3 August, 1914, on the eve of the outbreak of war between Britain and Germany. It was there revealed that since 1906, in consequence of certain representations by France, conversations between military and naval experts of the two countries had taken place with a view to preparing plans for common action if occasion should arise, but it was clearly understood that these conversations were in no way to limit the freedom of the Governments to decide their course of action in any emergency. The fact that such conversations had taken place was known to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Lord Haldane, and Mr. Asquith, but was withheld from the Cabinet for some time. In consequence of the second Morocco crisis, which will be dealt with below, it was deemed advisable to have a written understanding securing British freedom of action, and accordingly Sir Edward Grey wrote a letter in this sense to the French Ambassador on 22 November, 1912. The terms of this important letter were as follows:—

My Dear Ambassador,—From time to time in recent years the French and British naval and military experts have consulted together. It has always been understood that such consultation does not restrict the freedom of either Government to decide at any future time whether or not to assist the other by armed force. We have agreed that consultation between the experts is not and ought not to be regarded as an engagement that commits either Government to action in a contingency that has not yet arisen and may never arise. The disposition, for instance, of the French and British Fleets respectively at the present moment is not based upon an engagement to co-operate in war. You have, however, pointed out that if either Government had grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power it might become essential to know whether it could in that event depend upon the armed assistance of the other. I agree that if either Government had grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power or something that threatened the general peace it should immediately discuss with the other whether both Governments should act together to prevent aggression and to preserve peace, and, if so, what measures they would be prepared to take in common.

Sir Edward Grey then proceeded to interpret the facts as involving a moral obligation to give France armed naval assistance against the attack of Germany, and to defend this as required by British interests. That is to say, an entente based upon a comprehensive settlement of outstanding differences had insensibly assumed all the firmness of a defensive alliance with an added touch of moral dignity. The crushing defeat of Russia by Japan in the war of 1904–5 doubtless strengthened the Franco-British understanding by rendering Russian support under the Dual Alliance of small value to France.


Epilogue


THE MOROCCO CRISIS AND THE ALGECIRAS CONFERENCE, 1905–6.—The Franco-British agreement was hardly a year old when it was subjected to a severe test by Germany in respect of its Moroccan arrangement, and it was owing to this crisis that the military and naval conversations between Britain and France above mentioned first took place. Germany's contention that the Moroccan question was a European interest to be settled by a European Conference was not without justification, and was in the end admitted subject to reservation of the special interests of France and Spain; but it may be here remarked that her attitude regarding Morocco differed markedly from her attitude in regard to the Austro-Servian quarrel which occasioned the great European war of 1914. If she had been willing to admit that the latter question was also of European interest, Europe might have been spared a desolating and disastrous war.

The German Emperor visited Tangier on 31 March, 1905, and caused it to be known that Germany claimed equal rights in Morocco with other nations and meant to maintain intact the integrity of the Moorish Empire. The Sultan of Morocco rejected France's proposed reforms, and, at the suggestion of Germany, asked for a conference of the Powers. The negotiator of the Franco-British agreement, M. Delcassé, who was still French Foreign Minister, resigned rather than agree to such a conference, but after his resignation France agreed subject to German recognition of her special interests. France's acquiescence involved that of Britain, which had stood loyally by the agreement of the preceding year. The conference of the Powers met on 16 January, 1906, at Algeciras, a small town in the south of Spain, near Gibraltar. An agreement was reached and signed in April, and came into force at the end of the year.

THE RUSSO-BRITISH AGREEMENT, 1907.—The *entente* between Britain and France, along with the earlier Dual Alliance between Russia and France, had practically made a triple combination of Powers intended as a counterpoise to the Triple Alliance, but the combination could not be regarded as fully effective until Britain and Russia had settled their outstanding differences and adjusted their conflicting interests. British policy had long been mistrustful of Russian designs, both in Asia and in the Balkans, and the popular sympathies of democratic Britain were opposed to the bureaucratic autocracy of Russia; and even the undoubted advantages of a Central Asian settlement between the two Powers could not arouse popular enthusiasm for Russia in Britain. An *entente cordiale* was out of the question, but the removal of possible *casus belli* by a friendly official agreement was of undoubted advantage, although there were serious misgivings in Britain when it was known that a consequence of the agreement was the opening of the London money market to supply the needs of the Russian bureaucracy.

The Russo-British agreement was signed on 31 August, 1907, and published in Britain on 24 September. Both Governments agreed to respect the integrity and independence of Persia, but spheres of influ-





THE NORTH SEA AND THE BALTIc

English Miles

Scale



Spijland and
Ijsselmeer

Wadden Sea

North Sea

English Channel

Mediterranean

Black Sea

Aegean Sea

Red Sea

Gulf of Aden

Indian Ocean

South Pacific

South Atlantic

North Pacific

Arctic Ocean

North Sea

Baltic Sea

North Sea

English Channel

Mediterranean

Black Sea

Red Sea

Gulf of Aden

Indian Ocean


South Pacific

South Atlantic

North Pacific

Arctic Ocean

North Sea



ence were delimited. Afghanistan was recognized as within the British sphere of influence, but its independence and integrity were not to be infringed by Britain. The territorial integrity of Tibet and the suzerainty of China over that country were recognized by both the contracting parties. By way of signalizing the conclusion of the agreement King Edward paid a state visit to the Russian port of Reval in June, 1908.

The Russo-British agreement completed the diplomatic grouping of the Powers which was to issue in the European war of 1914. The general conflagration to which the armed peace seemed to be tending almost broke out over the Bosnian question in 1908-9, and again over the Moroccan question in 1911, but the catastrophe was postponed till 1914.

THE TURKISH REVOLUTION AND THE BOSNIAN CRISIS, 1908-9.—In July, 1908, Europe was startled by the outbreak of a Liberal revolution in Turkey. A secret society, called the Committee of Union and Progress, or the Young Turkey party, had been carrying on a propaganda in the army for several years, and so great was their success that their demand for constitutional government in 1908 was at once conceded by the Sultan. Turkey seemed to be entering on a new phase of her history as a Liberal constitutional state, but the expectations of western Europe were doomed to bitter disappointment.

The importance of this Turkish revolution for our present purpose consists in the fact that it provided the occasion for Bulgaria and Austria-Hungary to break through articles of the Treaty of Berlin, which settled Balkan relations under the sanction of the Powers in 1878. Bulgaria proclaimed herself an independent kingdom on 5 October, 1908, in violation of Article I of that treaty, and Austria-Hungary proclaimed the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, two days later, in violation of Article XXV, by which she was allowed to occupy and administer these provinces under the suzerainty of the Sultan. At the same time she withdrew her garrisons from the sanjak of Novi-Bazar, ostensibly as evidence of her pacific intentions. Russia, as the champion of Slav peoples, protested against Austria's action and demanded that the question should be submitted to a conference of the Powers signatory to the Treaty of Berlin. She was supported in this demand by Britain, France, and Italy. M. Isvolsky, on behalf of Russia, rested his demand on the Declaration signed at London on 17 January, 1871, by Britain, Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Turkey, in which these Powers "recognize that it is an essential principle of the Law of Nations that no Power can liberate itself from the engagements of a treaty nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the Contracting Powers by means of an amicable arrangement". Austria expressed her assent to the proposed Conference, but firmly refused to submit the Bosnian question to it except as a *fait accompli* to be formally regularized. Later, she was willing to enter on an informal discussion of the question among the Powers preparatory to the Conference, but in the end she

Epilogue

was left in possession of her spoil without a conference, though she had to give pecuniary compensation to Turkey and to consent to modify Article XXIX of the Treaty of Berlin in favour of Montenegro.

Austria was almost embroiled in war with Servia, supported by Montenegro, over the question, and owing to Russia's preparations to support Servia she had to mobilize her army. Early in 1909, however, Prince Bülow, the German Chancellor, brought decisive influence to bear at St. Petersburg, probably by threatening to join Austria under the terms of the Triple Alliance if Russia should join Servia. Russia, being unprepared for armed resistance, at once gave way and influenced Servia to do the same. All the Powers then acquiesced in the Austrian annexation, and the peace of Europe was preserved. A serious blow had been dealt to the authority of the public law of Europe, and in consequence the rivalry of military and naval armaments became keener than ever. The Franco-Russo-British combination had been drawn closer, and Italy had given it steady support throughout the crisis. Italy and Russia entered into an agreement in October, 1909, for the protection of their common interests in the Balkans. Europe had taken a long step towards the war of 1914.

THE SECOND MOROCCO CRISIS, 1911.—In February, 1909, Germany concluded an agreement with France regarding Morocco which amounted to an acceptance by her of the Moroccan clause of the Franco-British agreement of 1904. It was thought that the Moroccan problem had then reached a final solution, so far as it affected the international situation in Europe, but in the summer of 1911 an even more acute crisis than that of 1905 suddenly startled diplomatic Europe and brought the nations to the verge of war. A rebel movement in Morocco in the spring of 1911 led to French intervention on behalf of the hard-pressed Sultan. A French force marched to his relief in Fez, and after driving off the rebels remained to pacify the district. At the beginning of July Germany dispatched a warship, the *Panther*, to the closed Moroccan port of Agadir "to safeguard the persons and property of German subjects"; but, as there were no German subjects or property to be safeguarded, the real object of Germany must have been to re-open the whole question, which was supposed to have been settled by the Algeciras Conference of 1906 and the Franco-German treaty of 1909. Germany made heavy demands upon France, including the cession of a large part of French Congo. The British Government stood by France, according to the agreement of 1904, and also in defence of British interests, and at a Mansion House dinner on 21 July Mr. Lloyd George, with the concurrence of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, spoke grave words of warning intended for Germany. He said: "I would make great sacrifices to preserve peace. I conceive that nothing would justify a disturbance of international goodwill except questions of the greatest national moment. But if a situation were to be forced upon us in which peace could only be preserved by the surrender of the great and beneficent position Britain has won by centuries of heroism and achievement, by allowing Britain to be

treated where her interests were vitally affected as if she were of no account in the Cabinet of nations, then I say emphatically that peace at that price would be a humiliation intolerable for a great country like ours to endure."

Germany was compelled to moderate her demands, and after prolonged negotiations the affair was settled by treaties signed by France and Germany on 5 November. Germany agreed to recognize a French protectorate in Morocco in return for a readjustment of territorial frontiers in the Kamerun-French Congo district of West Africa in favour of Germany. The German colonial party were dissatisfied with the results of the adventure, and blamed Britain for having frustrated the realization of their hopes. The result was an embitterment of relations between Germany and the Franco-British combination. Europe had taken another step towards war; another incident of the same kind would probably end in war.

THE TURCO-ITALIAN WAR, 1911-12.—The German adventure in Morocco aroused the fears of Italy lest the long-coveted province of Tripoli might be lost to her, as Tunis was in 1881, and in order to forestall any other Power she determined to seize it without delay. Certain grievances of Italian subjects in Tripoli led to strained relations, and on 29 September, 1911, after an ultimatum, she declared war on Turkey. She had no difficulty in occupying the coast of Tripoli, but the conquest of the interior was beset with serious difficulties because of Arab as well as Turkish hostility. The war put some strain on the relations of Italy with her allies of the Triple Alliance, and also on her relations with France and Britain. On 5 November Italy declared Tripolitania and Cyrenaica annexed to the Italian kingdom, and this annexation was virtually though not formally recognized by the treaty of peace signed between Italy and Turkey at Ouchy, in Switzerland, on 15 October, 1912. Turkey was forced to conclude peace not only because her position in Tripoli was hopeless, but also because she was in danger from the attack of the Balkan League.

THE BALKAN WARS, 1912-13.—The close of the Turco-Italian war found Turkey on the verge of war with a league of the Balkan States, Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, and Greece. Montenegro, always greatly daring, declared war against Turkey on 8 October, 1912, in advance of her allies, and immediately began military operations. The other Christian states presented their ultimatum on 18 October, three days after the Treaty of Ouchy, and Turkey replied by a declaration of war. The war is of essential importance as a factor contributory to the general European war of 1914, but its military details need not be set out in more than a brief summary. The Servian army carried everything before it in northern Macedonia and northern Albania, its chief victories being Kumanovo (23 October) and Monastir (15 November). The Bulgarians had to face the main Turkish army in Thrace, and gained, at immense cost, the great victories of Kirk Kilisse (23 October) and Lule Burgas (30 October), but failed in their attack on the fortified

Epilogue

dispatch by saying: "It seems to me, from the language held by the French Ambassador, that, even if we decline to join them, France and Russia are determined to make a strong stand". In a note communicated by the German Ambassador on the same day (No. 9) German approval of Austria's action is clearly stated, and the German view of the international position is expressed as follows:—

The Imperial Government want to emphasise their opinion that in the present case there is only question of a matter to be settled exclusively between Austria-Hungary and Servia, and that the Great Powers ought seriously to endeavour to reserve it to those two immediately concerned. The Imperial Government desire urgently the localization of the conflict, because every interference of another Power would, owing to the different treaty obligations, be followed by incalculable consequences.

On that day also (24 July) Sir Edward Grey suggested to both Paris (No. 10) and Berlin (No. 11) that Britain, Germany, Italy, and France should act together at Vienna and St. Petersburg in the interests of peace. The notable feature of this suggestion was that it contemplated common action by two Powers from each of the great European diplomatic groups in order to keep the peace between the remaining two, who were in danger of being embroiled over Servia. Another dispatch of Sir Edward Grey on that anxious day (No. 12) urged Servia to make as favourable a reply as possible to Austria, and at least to avoid an absolute refusal.

Russia's position is clearly and firmly stated in a dispatch (No. 17) of 25 July from Sir George Buchanan to Sir Edward Grey. She believed that Austria was bent on war in order to reopen the Balkan question and establish her hegemony in the Balkans, and Russia could not permit this. Russia desired to have the question placed on an international footing, whereas Germany regarded it as one concerning Austria and Servia alone. Russia was willing to leave the question in the hands of Britain, France, Germany, and Italy; M. Sazonoff thought that war would be averted if Britain took her stand at once firmly with France and Russia. The German Foreign Secretary (Nos. 18 and 25), on the same day, emphatically denied prior knowledge of the terms of the Austrian note to Servia. The Servian reply to the Austrian ultimatum (No. 39) was sent to Vienna on 25 July. It was extremely conciliatory, and agreed to all the demands of Austria except two that involved impairment of her position as a sovereign, independent state, and it ended by suggesting reference of these two to the Hague Tribunal or to the Great Powers, to whom Servia had made her declaration of 31 March, 1909. The reply not being an integral acceptance of the Austrian demands, the Austro-Hungarian minister left Belgrade on 25 July, and on 28 July Austria declared war on Servia. One cannot escape the conclusion that Austria was determined on war at any cost, and on her must be placed the primary responsibility for producing the outbreak of the general European

On 26 July, the day following the withdrawal of the Austrian Minister from Belgrade, Sir Edward Grey formally proposed (No. 36), at Paris, Berlin, and Rome, a conference of representatives of Britain, France, Germany, and Italy, in order to discover a way of preventing complications. France and Italy agreed at once, but Germany declined (No. 43) on the ground that the conference was not practicable, and preferred direct exchange of views between Vienna and St. Petersburg. Sir Edward Grey made very firm representations to Austria (No. 48), and urged Germany to use her influence at Vienna for peace (No. 46). Austria, however, refused every kind of discussion on the basis of the Servian reply (No. 62), and the great tragedy steadily developed.

THE RUSSO-GERMAN RUPTURE, 1 AUGUST, 1914.—The Austrian declaration of war on Servia caused Russia to mobilize her army in the south on 29 July, but war might even then have been averted if Austria could have been induced to refrain from attack on Servia, so as to give diplomacy time to adjust the questions at issue. Sir Edward Grey did not yet abandon the hope of a peaceful settlement, and in a telegraphic dispatch to Berlin, on 29 July (No. 84), endeavoured to gain German consent to co-operation of the four disinterested Powers by leaving it to the German Government to suggest the particular method of action to be taken. He realized that German co-operation was essential to success, and Germany's refusal to join the peacemakers imposes on her the chief share of responsibility for the war.

In a telegraphic dispatch of 29 July (No. 85), Sir Edward Goschen, British Ambassador in Berlin, tells how Germany, having made up her mind that she would have to join Austria against Russia because of her treaty obligations, and knowing that France would be drawn in also under treaty obligations, made a strong bid for British neutrality. She disclaimed all intention of making territorial acquisitions at the expense of France, but would give no undertaking in regard to the French colonies. She would respect the integrity and neutrality of Holland, but in regard to Belgium she would not do more than promise to respect her integrity if she had not sided against Germany. Sir Edward Grey, on 30 July (No. 101), emphatically rejected this "infamous proposal", as Mr. Asquith subsequently called it, but added the following remarkable paragraph:—

If the peace of Europe can be preserved, and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavour will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, and ourselves, jointly or separately. I have desired this and worked for it, as far as I could, through the last Balkan crisis, and, Germany having a corresponding object, our relations sensibly improved. The idea has hitherto been too Utopian to form the subject of definite proposals, but if this present crisis, so much more acute than any that Europe has gone through for generations, be safely passed, I am hopeful that the relief and reaction which will follow may make possible some more definite *rapprochement* between the Powers than has been possible hitherto.

Epilogue

This striking offer of a *rapprochement* between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente is the most statesmanlike utterance in the whole of the tortuous negotiations, and may be recalled to some fruitful purpose when the time for a general political settlement comes.

Germany sent a request to Russia asking her on what conditions she would consent to demobilization. Russia replied that she would do so if Austria gave an assurance that she would respect the sovereignty of Servia and submit certain of the demands of the Austrian Note to an international discussion. France meanwhile tried to get Britain to throw her weight into the scale of peace by announcing that she would come to the aid of France in the event of a German attack; but Sir Edward Grey could not go beyond warning Germany not to count upon our neutrality in all circumstances. On 31 July Sir Edward Grey learned that conversations had been resumed between Russia and Austria, and did his best to encourage them. He also, on the same day, communicated the following important offer (No. 111) to Berlin through the British Ambassador there:—

I said to German Ambassador this morning that if Germany could get any reasonable proposal put forward which made it clear that Germany and Austria were striving to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it, I would support it at St. Petersburg and Paris, and go the length of saying that if Russia and France would not accept it His Majesty's Government would have nothing more to do with the consequences; but, otherwise, I told German Ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in.

This offer, involving the possible abandonment of the Triple Entente as a diplomatic group, is notable as evidence of Sir Edward Grey's strong desire to preserve peace, but it was too late to avert the catastrophe. Russia's partial mobilization caused Austria to mobilize further; then Russia, on 31 July, ordered a general mobilization; Germany thereupon sent an ultimatum to Russia demanding demobilization. This ultimatum included a time limit of twelve hours. No reply being received, Germany, which had already made some preparations, ordered a general mobilization of her army and navy, and declared war against Russia on 1 August.

THE BRITO-GERMAN RUPTURE, 4 AUGUST, 1914.—Austria being now at war with Servia, and Germany at war with Russia, a general European war could not be long delayed. France was involved as the ally of Russia; but Britain's position was for a day or two in doubt, the determining factors being the neutrality of Belgium and her obligation of honour to France. On 31 July, when Germany's intervention in the war was almost certain, Sir Edward Grey enquired of both the French and German Governments whether they were prepared to engage to respect the neutrality of Belgium (No. 114). France at once agreed to do so (No. 125), but Germany declined (No. 122). On 1 August, Sir Edward Grey expressed to the German Ambassador (No. 123) his

great regret at Germany's reply regarding Belgian neutrality, and warned him of the possible consequences. On being asked whether a promise not to violate Belgian neutrality would ensure British neutrality, Sir Edward Grey replied in a non-committal way, and on being pressed to formulate conditions of British neutrality he declined, although a guarantee of the integrity of France and her colonies was indicated by the Ambassador as possible. In these suggestions the German Ambassador spoke for himself and not for his Government, which had determined to make its attack on France across Belgium.

On 2 August Sir Edward Grey took the decisive step in committing Britain to active intervention in the war by handing to the French Ambassador, with the authority of the Cabinet, the following memorandum (No. 148):—

I am authorised to give an assurance that, if the German fleet comes into the Channel or through the North Sea to undertake hostile operations against French coasts or shipping, the British fleet will give all the protection in its power. This assurance is of course subject to the policy of His Majesty's Government receiving the support of Parliament, and must not be taken as binding His Majesty's Government to take any action until the above contingency of action by the German fleet takes place.

The question of Belgian neutrality assumed a more acute form when the King of the Belgians made the following appeal to King George V:—

Remembering the numerous proofs of your Majesty's friendship and that of your predecessor, and the friendly attitude of England in 1870 and the proof of friendship you have just given us again, I make a supreme appeal to the diplomatic intervention of your Majesty's Government to safeguard the integrity of Belgium.

Germany sent to Belgium a note proposing friendly neutrality entailing free passage through Belgian territory, and promising to maintain the independence and integrity of the kingdom and its possessions at the conclusion of peace; threatening, in case of refusal, to treat Belgium as an enemy. An answer was requested within twelve hours. Belgium replied with a categorical refusal, and Sir Edward Grey requested from Germany (No. 153) an immediate assurance that the demand made upon Belgium would not be proceeded with and that her neutrality would be respected. On the morning of 4 August Germany sent a note to Belgium (No. 154), stating that, as the Belgian Government had declined their proposals, Germany would be compelled to carry out, if necessary by force of arms, the measures considered necessary in view of the French menaces. Sir Edward Grey thereupon (No. 155) promised to support Belgium in offering resistance to the violation of her territory. Germany made a lame explanation to London (No. 157) that her action in Belgium was necessitated by

Epilogue

French plans of which she said she had unimpeachable information. The British ultimatum to Germany was sent on 4 August through the British Ambassador at Berlin in the following terms:—

We hear that Germany has addressed note to Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs stating that German Government will be compelled to carry out, if necessary, by force of arms, the measures considered indispensable. We are also informed that Belgian territory has been violated at Gemmenich. In these circumstances, and in view of the fact that Germany declined to give the same assurance respecting Belgium as France gave last week in reply to our request made simultaneously at Berlin and Paris, we must repeat that request, and ask that a satisfactory reply to it and to my telegram of this morning be received here by 12 o'clock to-night. If not, you are instructed to ask for your passports, and to say that His Majesty's Government feel bound to take all steps in their power to uphold the neutrality of Belgium and the observance of a treaty to which Germany is as much a party as ourselves.

No satisfactory reply being received, the two countries were henceforth in a state of war with each other. The Imperial Chancellor, in a farewell interview with Sir Edward Goschen, was very indignant at Britain for going to war over "a scrap of paper", as he called the Belgian treaty.

THE GROUPING OF THE POWERS.—By 4 August Germany was at war with Britain, France, Russia, and Belgium; and Austria was at war with Servia. The further inevitable developments were not long in coming to pass. Italy declared that, as Germany was engaged in an aggressive war, no *casus fæderis* under the Triple Alliance had arisen, and she would therefore maintain a strict neutrality. This is not surprising after the recent trend of events in Europe. France broke off relations with Austria on 10 August, because Austrian corps were assisting Germany against France, and Britain in consequence declared a state of war with Austria from midnight on 12 August. Russia and Austria were officially at war with each other from 6 August, and Montenegro declared war against Austria on 7 August. On 15 August Japan, which had been in alliance with Britain since 1902, and had also entered into agreements with Russia and France in 1907, issued an ultimatum to Germany, giving her seven days to evacuate Kiao-chow in China. No reply being received, Japan declared war against Germany on 23 August, and immediately afterwards Austria broke off diplomatic relations with the Far Eastern Power. Japan has given an assurance that when she has taken Kiao-chow she will hand it back to China, and she is confining the area of her warlike operations to her own home waters. The other states are remaining neutral, but those in Europe have all mobilized to some extent to be ready for any emergency. Germany has no friend among the neutral states, with the possible exception of Sweden, which fears Russian designs against her integrity.

The following statement shows the military and naval strength of the chief states involved in the war:—

The Position of the Small States

205

ARMIES

		Peace Footing.	War Footing.
Germany	800,000	5,000,000
Austria-Hungary		<u>430,000</u>	<u>2,500,000</u>
<i>Germanic Group</i>		<u>7,500,000</u>
France	790,000	3,800,000
Russia	1,500,000	5,000,000
Britain	720,000	850,000
Belgium	50,000	350,000
Servia	40,000	350,000
Japan	<u>230,000</u>	<u>2,000,000</u>
<i>The Allies</i> ...		<u>3,330,000</u>	<u>12,350,000</u>

NAVIES

In the following list vessels building at the beginning of 1914 are counted, but all vessels more than twenty years old are omitted. The figures in parentheses, under "Battleships and Battle Cruisers", denote the number of ships of Dreadnought and super-Dreadnought class.

	Battleships and Battle Cruisers.	Cruisers and Light Cruisers.	Destroyers.	Torpedo Boats.	Sub- marines.
Britain ...	82 (41)	132	237	106	98
France ...	31 (12)	32	87	153	76
Russia ...	19 (11)	22	140	25	43
Japan ...	<u>23</u> (7)	<u>34</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>15</u>
<i>The Allies</i>	<u>155</u> (71)	<u>220</u>	<u>517</u>	<u>317</u>	<u>232</u>
Germany ...	48 (28)	58	144	80	40
Austria-Hungary	16 (4)	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>11</u>
<i>Germanic Group</i>	<u>64</u> (32)	<u>72</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>51</u>

THE POSITION OF THE SMALL STATES.—The neutrality of Belgium and Luxemburg has figured so prominently in the negotiations leading to the outbreak of war between Britain and Germany that it will be of service to state the international position exactly, not only regarding these countries, but also regarding other small states that may yet become involved in the struggle. Under the Treaty of London, signed 15 November, 1831, it is declared (Art. VII) that "Belgium . . . shall form an independent and perpetually Neutral State. It shall be bound to observe such Neutrality towards all other States"; and this neutrality and independence are guaranteed in Art. XXV by Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia. This treaty was superseded by another signed at London by the above Powers, with the addition of Holland, on 19 April, 1839. Art. VII of the new treaty is an exact reproduction of the above Art. VII, but the formal guarantee of Art. XXV is omitted. In 1870, at the outbreak of war between France and Prussia, Britain concluded identical treaties with the two combatants, by which each combatant undertook to respect the neutrality of Belgium, and Britain undertook to remain neutral unless in the event of either

Epilogue

combatant violating Belgian neutrality. These special treaties were declared to be valid for the period of the war and one year longer.

The governing factor in regard to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is Art. II of the Treaty signed at London on 11 May, 1867, which reads as follows:—

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg . . . under the Guarantee of the Courts of Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia, shall henceforth form a perpetually Neutral State. It shall be bound to observe the same Neutrality towards all other States. The High Contracting Parties engage to respect the principle of Neutrality stipulated by the present Article. That principle is and remains under the sanction of the collective Guarantee of the Powers signing Parties to the present Treaty.

This “scrap of paper”, as the German Chancellor would contemptuously call it, is much more precise and binding than that governing Belgian neutrality. At the outbreak of the war of 1870 France and Prussia both engaged to respect the neutrality of Luxembourg.

The perpetual neutrality of Switzerland is guaranteed by all the Powers in a Declaration signed at Vienna on 20 March, 1815, accepted by Switzerland on 27 May, 1815, and embodied in the great Vienna Congress Treaty of 9 June, 1815, which established the re-settlement of Europe after the last general war. Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway are not under any international guarantee, because they are not under a perpetual obligation of neutrality.

The negotiations related in the White Paper show that the German Government was prepared to cast its treaty obligations regarding Belgium and Luxembourg to the winds on the plea of military necessity. Their case is stated even more bluntly and brutally in the speech delivered by the Imperial Chancellor, Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, in the Reichstag, on 4 August, the day when the British ultimatum expired. The following is the relevant passage:—

Gentlemen, we are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxembourg, and perhaps are already on Belgian soil. Gentlemen, that is contrary to the dictates of international law. It is true that the French Government has declared at Brussels that France is willing to respect the neutrality of Belgium as long as her opponent respects it. We knew, however, that France stood ready for the invasion. France could wait, but we could not wait. A French movement upon our flank upon the lower Rhine might have been disastrous. So we were compelled to override the just protest of the Luxembourg and Belgian Governments. The wrong—I speak openly—that we are committing we will endeavour to make good as soon as our military goal has been reached. Anybody who is threatened, as we are threatened, and is fighting for his highest possessions can have only one thought—how he is to hack his way through.

THE WAR OF THE NATIONS.—Immediately after her declaration of



BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF FRENCH AND BELGIAN FRONTIERS WITH GERMANY

war against Russia, Germany invaded Luxemburg and Belgium and crossed the French frontier in Lorraine. The German plan was obviously to make a swift and overwhelming attack on France by way of Belgium and Luxemburg, and to reach Paris before the Russian hosts were ready to move westwards towards Berlin. She had counted on the neutrality of Britain and the active assistance of Italy, her partner in the Triple Alliance, and she had assumed that Belgian opposition would be easily overcome. In all these expectations she was disappointed. Britain came into the field against her both on land and on sea; Italy maintained a neutrality that seemed likely to turn to hostility at the first favourable opportunity; and Belgium put up a resistance so skilful and heroic as to delay the German advance very seriously.

The British fleet, under Sir John Jellicoe, almost without a blow, put the German High Sea fleet out of account by containing it in the Heligoland Bay, about the mouths of the Elbe and Weser, and established an effective blockade of the German North Sea coast. Only a few commerce-destroying cruisers were at large in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and other oceans, but the Allies' cruisers prevented them from doing much mischief and kept the seas safe for British and French foreign trade. The German cruisers in the Mediterranean were driven to the Dardanelles, where they passed by sale into the possession of Turkey. The Austrian fleet in this sea was also reduced to impotence, and one of its cruisers was sunk. Thus, with the utmost ease, the commerce of the Germanic Powers was swept from the ocean, and the foreign trade of these countries was left open to capture by their enemies. The most notable early naval encounter of the war took place near Heligoland on 28 August, when a force of British destroyers, light cruisers, and battle cruisers, aided by submarines, gained a brilliant victory over a portion of the German fleet. Three German cruisers and two destroyers were sunk, with considerable loss of life, but the British losses were comparatively light. The Germans have sown floating mines in the North Sea, and have thereby caused the destruction of several trading vessels.

The German attack on Belgium began with an attempt to reduce the strongly fortified town of Liége, but the determined defence of the Belgians under General Leman repelled the Germans repeatedly, and it was only after losing heavily in men and a most serious loss of time that they entered into possession of the town. The forts were reduced by exceptionally powerful siege guns. The Belgian army could not, however, with all its courage and resource, keep the Germans back very long, and at length, on 20 August, the Germans took possession of Brussels without resistance, the Belgian army and Government having retired within the fortified lines of Antwerp. The Germans committed numerous atrocities in Belgium, the worst being the almost complete destruction of Louvain, with its noble buildings and famous library.

Meantime Britain and France were preparing to repel the German

Epilogue

onslaught. Lord Kitchener, who became Secretary for War on 5 August, rapidly organized the British Expeditionary Force, and by the middle of August it was safely landed at Boulogne under the leadership of Sir John French, thanks to the complete command of the sea established by the navy. Sir John French's troops acted along with the French armies under the supreme command of General Joffre. The first big battle, that of Mons-Charleroi, was fought on 23 August. The French centre on the Sambre was driven in after fierce fighting and heavy losses on both sides, but the British on the left, with Mons as their centre, stood their ground against heavy odds and repeated attacks until the French retreat forced them to fall back. The British force consisted of two army corps commanded by Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien and Sir Douglas Haig, with supporting cavalry under Major-General Allenby and Sir Philip Chetwode. The British retreat in face of the enemy was carried out on 24 August with masterly skill amid continuous fighting of a very severe character, and it continued on the next day under conditions of less severity. By the night of 25 August the British Army occupied the line Cambrai-Landrecies-Le Cateau. It was Sir John French's intention to continue the retreat on 26 August, but a very fierce German attack had first of all to be repelled. The British force, though outnumbered by three to one, gave a splendid account of itself and upheld the best traditions of British valour on the battlefield. The force extricated itself in good order, after heavy losses, but the German losses were enormously greater. In the words of Lord Kitchener: "The Germans have been made to pay the extreme price for any forward march they have made". The retreat of 23-26 August was practically a four days' battle. On 28 August a British cavalry brigade, under General Chetwode, fought a brilliantly successful action with the German cavalry.

The strategic retreat of the Allies to the south was continued till the first week of September, with constant rearguard fighting, and the German forces steadily advanced down the valley of the Oise towards Paris. The French Government withdrew temporarily to Bordeaux, and Paris prepared to withstand a siege. After the four days' battle above described the British force was supported on the left by the Seventh French Army and on the right by the Fifth French Army, and the latter gained a substantial victory over three German corps near Guise on 29 August. On 1 September the First British Cavalry Brigade and the Fourth Guards Brigade gained a brilliant victory over a German force near Compiègne, capturing ten guns.

The retreat of the Allies was not arrested until they had taken up positions south of the Marne from about Meaux to Vitry-le-François, and thence north-east to the strong fortress of Verdun. A complete change of the German plan then became apparent. Paris was neglected, and the attempt to envelop the left flank of the Allies was abandoned in favour of a concentration against their centre. The time had, however, at last arrived for the Allies to take the offensive. On 7 September fighting began along the whole long line from Paris to Verdun. On

the west the British force, co-operating with the French Fifth Army on its right and a new French Sixth Army from the north-west of Paris on its left, forced back the German right wing under General von Kluck on 7 September, and began a successful flank movement, which was continued on subsequent days and caused a rapid German retreat north-eastwards. At the same time the German centre, under the Duke of Würtemberg, was heavily engaged with the French about Vitry, and it was only after several days of severe fighting that the Germans gave way here on 11 September. The German left wing, where the Crown Prince was in command, was successfully held by the French and eventually forced to retire north, abandoning the district around Nancy and Verdun. The five days' battle of the Marne had resulted in victory for the Allies, but the Germans re-formed across the Aisne after their retreat, prepared to make a very prolonged and determined stand in positions of great strength. The tide of war in the west had, however, turned, and the strategic retreat from Mons to Paris was vindicated.

At the time when the Allies began to drive the Germans back in the western theatre of war the Russians found themselves in a position to press their advance towards Berlin from the east. They had invaded East Prussia and advanced towards the lower Vistula, after gaining a victory over the Germans at Gumbinnen and suffering a serious reverse at Osterode. On their other flank, in Austrian Galicia, they routed a large Austrian army, capturing an enormous number of prisoners and a huge quantity of war material. This victory put them in possession of Lemberg, the Galician capital, and was followed by other decisive victories over the Austrians which gave them complete occupation of Galicia, thus enabling them to undertake the invasion of Germany. The Servians had previously inflicted heavy defeats on the Austrians, at Shabatz and Jadar, and they advanced to the occupation of Serajevo.

Even in the early days of the war Germany suffered in her colonial empire. On 7 August a British force from the Gold Coast occupied southern Togoland in West Africa, and on 26 August the whole colony was unconditionally surrendered. Apia, the capital of German Samoa, surrendered to a New Zealand force on 29 August. Fighting took place on the frontiers of Nyassaland and German East Africa, and the Union of South Africa prepared to occupy German South-West Africa. A force from the Australian Commonwealth took possession of the Bismarck Archipelago and of German New Guinea.

An agreement in the following terms was signed on 5 September by Britain, France, and Russia: "The British, French, and Russian Governments mutually engage not to conclude peace separately during the present war. The three Governments agree that when terms of peace come to be discussed no one of the Allies will demand conditions of peace without the previous agreement of each of the other Allies." Japan adhered to this declaration a few days later. This step may be regarded as giving the Triple Entente a more intimate and binding unity.

APPENDICES

CHRONOLOGICAL CONSPECTUS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY

THE GREAT MOVEMENTS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY

NOTES ON HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOME HISTORICAL TALES AND ROMANCES

CHRONOLOGICAL CONSPECTUS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY

IV. FROM THE OUTBREAK OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION TO THE PRESENT DAY

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION: A.D. 1789-1799

A.D.	
1789.	Bread Riots in France. Gustavus III made Swedish monarchy virtually absolute. States General met in Versailles (May 4). Third Estate declared itself a NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (June 17). Joseph II cancelled the liberties of Brabant. Oath of the Tennis Court. Union of the Three Estates. Committee of the Constitution appointed. King dismissed Necker. Fall of the Bastille (July 14). <i>Battle of Focșani</i> : Turks defeated by Austrians and Russians. King recalled Necker. Great reforming session of National Assembly on August 4: feudal tenures abolished, &c. Declaration of the Rights of Man. <i>Battle of Rîmnik</i> : Turks defeated by Austrians and Russians. Émeute in Paris: mob marched to Versailles: King and National Assembly went to Paris (Oct.). Austrians took Belgrade. Church lands nationalized by National Assembly (Nov.). Assignats first issued (Dec.). Washington elected first President of the United States. Selim III became Sultan of Turkey.
1790.	Belgian Republic constituted (Jan.): suppressed in November. Alliance between Prussia and Turkey. National Assembly deprived monastic vows of force and suppressed religious orders. Leopold II Emperor. Convention of Reichenbach: ended war between Austria and Turkey and Russia: war between Prussia and Austria averted. Suppression by France of a revolt in San Domingo. Treaty of Werelâ between Russia and Sweden. Civil constitution of the clergy enacted in France. Resignation of Necker. Nootka Sound Convention between Britain and Spain. Edmund Burke's <i>Reflections on the French Revolution</i> . National Assembly issued a decree imposing an oath on the clergy.
1791.	National Assembly decreed abolition of slavery in West Indies. Death of Mirabeau. New Polish constitution granted by Stanislas Poniatowski: throne made hereditary. Flight of Louis XVI to Varennes. Massacre of the Champ de Mars. Treaty of Sistova between Austria and Turkey.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.

1791. Conference of Pillnitz between Emperor and Prussian King to arrange for support of Louis XVI.
 Fresh negro revolt in San Domingo.
 New French Constitution enacted (Sept.).
 Union of Avignon and the Venaissin to France decreed.
 Louis XVI took the oath to the new Constitution.
 End of National Assembly (Sept. 30): LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY began next day.
 Treaty of Drottningholm between Sweden and Russia.
 Decree against the émigrés: vetoed by Louis XVI.
 Decree against non-juring priests: vetoed by Louis XVI.
 Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man* and Sir James Mackintosh's *Vindictæ Gallicæ*: replies to Burke's *Reflections*.
 Joseph Priestley's house in Birmingham burned down by mob.
 Wolfe Tone founded the Society of United Irishmen.
 Constitutional Act for Canada.
 Death of Mozart.
1792. Treaty of Jassy: ended war between Russia and Turkey: Russia obtained Crimea.
 Tipu surrendered Seringapatam to the British: end of Second Mysore War.
 Alliance between Austria and Prussia.
 Francis II became Emperor.
 Assassination of Gustavus III of Sweden: Gustavus IV succeeded.
 A Jacobin ministry in power in France.
 "Society of the Friends of the People" founded in Britain.
 France declared war against Austria (April 20).
 Russia invaded Poland and Lithuania.
 Insurrection in the Tuilleries at Paris: the Tuilleries later taken by the mob.
 Longwy taken from the French by the Allies: then Verdun.
 September Massacres in Paris.
Battle of Valmy: Dumouriez defeated Prussians.
 NATIONAL CONVENTION replaced Legislative Assembly (Sept. 21).
 Monarchy abolished in France.
 French took Nice, Spires, and Mainz.
Battle of Jemappes: Dumouriez defeated Austrians: Brussels occupied by French.
 National Convention offered its protection to all nations struggling for freedom.
 Opening of Scheldt to commerce.
 Trial of Louis XVI begun.
 Death of Sir Joshua Reynolds.
 Mary Wollstonecraft's *Rights of Women*.
 1793. Committee of General Defence in France.
 Execution of Louis XVI (Jan. 21).
 Second Partition of Poland.
 British Government declared war against France.
 France declared war against Britain and Holland.
 Royalist insurrection in the Vendée.
 William Godwin's *Political Justice*.
 French took Aix-la-Chapelle.
 Revolutionary Tribunal created in Paris.
Battle of Neerwinden: French defeated by Austrians: Brussels evacuated by French.
 French evacuated the Netherlands.
 Dumouriez deserted to the Austrians.
 First Committee of Public Safety.
 The Girondists proscribed.
 Vendéans failed to take Nantes.
Battle of Chatillon: Republican forces defeated in west of France by rebels.
 Second or Great Committee of Public Safety: more extreme. THE REIGN OF TERROR.
 Assassination of Marat by Charlotte Corday.
 Prussians took Mainz.
 Allies took Valenciennes.
 Toulon surrendered to Admiral Hood.
 French relieved Dunkirk.
 End of the Lyons revolt.
Battle of Wattignies: French under Jourdan victorious over Austrians.
Battle of Cholet: defeat of Vendéans.
 Execution of Marie Antoinette (Oct. 16).
Battle of Château Gontier: Western French rebels victorious under La Fayette.
 Lyons massacres.
 The Girondins executed.
 Notre Dame consecrated to the worship of Reason.

The French Revolution

211

A.D.

1793. Diet of Grodno agreed to partition of Poland and revoked the new Polish constitution.
 New Republican Calendar came into force in France.
Battle of Kaiserslautern: Hoche failed against the Austrians in a three days' battle.
 Law of 14 Frimaire made Committee of Public Safety supreme in France.
Battle of Le Mans: Vendéans crushed: great butchery.
 French recovered Toulon: Napoleon Bonaparte distinguished himself.
Battle of Savenay: Kléber finally defeated the Vendéans.
 British took Tobago from the French.
 1794. Hoche master of the Palatinate.
 Execution of the Hébertists.
 Manifesto of Kosciusko in Poland against Prussia and Russia.
Battle of Raslawice: Kosciusko defeated Russians.
 Execution of Dantonists.
 Russians evacuated Warsaw.
Battle of the First of June: Howe defeated the French fleet.
 Jourdan took Charleroi.
Battle of Rawka: Poles defeated by Prussians.
 Feast of the Supreme Being in Paris organized by Robespierre.
 Law of 22 Prairial strengthened Revolutionary Tribunal.
 Prussians took Cracow.
Battle of Fleurus: hard-won victory by Jourdan over Austrians under Coburg.
 William Pitt's coalition with the Portland Whigs.
 The Ninth Thermidor: fall of Robespierre.
 Execution of Robespierre, Saint-Just, &c.
 French took Fuenterrabia.
 Britain took Corsica.
 Jourdan took Cologne, Coblenz, &c.
Battle of Maciejówice: Kosciusko routed and taken prisoner by Russians; Russians recaptured Warsaw.
 Jacobin Club closed in Paris.
 French conquered all the North Catalan fortresses.
 British took Martinique, St. Lucia, &c.
 Trial of Hardy, Horne Tooke, &c., for high treason: acquitted.

A.D.

- Treaty between Emperor and Catherine of Russia for partition of Turkey, Venice, Poland, and Bavaria.
 Peace of La Jaunaise with Royalist rebels in western France.
 British took Ceylon and Malacca from Dutch.
 Insurrection of 12 Germinal in Paris: "Bread and the Constitution of 1793".
 TREATY OF BASLE between France and Prussia: Holland and Spain acceded later.
 Warren Hastings acquitted.
 Insurrection of 1 Prairial in Paris.
 Revolutionary Tribunal abolished in France.
 "White Terror" in southern France.
 Death of the French Dauphin in prison.
 Jourdan took Luxemburg.
 Royalist expedition landed in western France and crushed.
 Bilbao taken by French.
 Cape Town taken by British from Dutch.
 Orange Society founded in Ireland.
 Triple Alliance of Britain, Austria, and Russia.
 Constitution of the Year III proclaimed (Sept. 23).
 Belgium incorporated in France.
 Insurrection of Vendémiaire in Paris suppressed.
 THE DIRECTORY installed in France (Nov. 3).
Battle of Loano: French victory over Austrian and Sardinian forces.
 Abdication of Stanislas Poniatowski in Poland.
 French troops conquered Holland and established the Batavian Republic.
 French recaptured St. Lucia.
 1796. Bonaparte appointed to command the Army of Italy.
 Armistice of Cherasco: neutrality of Sardinia, &c.
 Conspiracy of Babeuf frustrated in Paris.
Battle of Lodi: Bonaparte defeated Austrians.
 French occupied Milan, but abandoned siege of Mantua.
Battle of Solferino: Bonaparte defeated Austrians under Wurmser.
 Treaty of San Ildefonso between France and Spain.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.

1796. Archduke Charles defeated Jourdan in Bavaria and drove him across the Rhine.

Cispadane Republic founded by Bonaparte: included Modena, Bologna, and Ferrara.

Battle of Arcola: Bonaparte's desperate victory over Austrians under Alvintzy.

Paul I Tsar of Russia.

British evacuated Corsica.

Battle of Lonato: Austrians defeated by French under Augereau.

British reconquered St. Lucia from French and took Demerara from the Dutch.

Adams elected President of United States.

Death of Robert Burns.

1797. Failure of Hoche's attempted invasion of Ireland.

THIRD AND FINAL PARTITION OF POLAND.

Bonaparte took Mantua.

Battle of Cape St. Vincent: Spanish fleet defeated by Jervis.

Pope submitted to Bonaparte.

Mutiny in British fleet at Spithead: demands granted.

Rising against French in Verona.

Battle of Neuwied: Austrians defeated by Hoche.

Preliminaries of peace at Leoben between Austria and Bonaparte.

Mutiny in British fleet at the Nore: special legislation against it.

French entered Venice.

Genoa became Ligurian Republic under French influence.

Cisalpine Republic established by Bonaparte in Lombardy.

Cispadane Republic united to Cisalpine Republic.

Treaty between France and Portugal.

Coup d'état of 18 Fructidor in France.

Battle of Camperdown: Dutch fleet under De Winter defeated by Duncan.

PEACE OF CAMPO FORMIO: Venice given to Austria: Ionian Islands to France: Austria surrendered Netherlands and recognized Cisalpine Republic.

Valtelline annexed to Cisalpine Republic.

Frederick William III King of Prussia.

Paul I made Protector of the Knights of Malta.

A.D.

1797. Congress of Rastatt.

Britain took Trinidad from Spain.

Cash payments suspended in Britain.

1798. Roman Republic declared, with aid of France: Temporal Power of Pope overthrown.

French occupation of Bern: Swiss Confederacy replaced by Helvetic Republic.

Fall of Godoy in Spain.

Battle of Vinegar Hill: Irish rebels defeated.

Sieyès elected a French Director.

Bonaparte's Egyptian expedition set sail: Malta taken.

Bonaparte took Alexandria.

French occupied citadel of Turin.

Battle of the Pyramids: French victory in Egypt: Bonaparte entered Cairo.

Battle of the Nile: Nelson destroyed French fleet under Brueys.

France at war with Turkey: Russian fleet in Mediterranean to help Turks.

Conscription introduced in France.

Rebellion in Cairo.

Paul I made Grand Master of the Knights of Malta.

Ferdinand IV of Naples entered Rome: retaken by French.

Abdication of Charles Emmanuel IV of Savoy.

Flight of Ferdinand of Naples.

Alliance between Russia and Turkey: soon joined by Britain.

Pitt introduced an Income Tax.

Malthus's *Essay on Population*.

Lyrical Ballads of Wordsworth and Coleridge.

1799. French occupation of Naples: Parthenopean Republic created.

Bonaparte's Syrian campaign begun: Jaffa taken.

Austria declared war against France.

Siege of Acre by French: failed.

Battle of Stockach: Jourdan defeated by Archduke Charles.

British stormed Seringapatam: Tipu killed.

Congress of Rastatt ended without result.

Milan taken by Russians and Austrians under Suvaroff.

Allies entered Turin.

A.D.

1799. *Battle of Modena*: French under Macdonald defeated Austrians.
 Naples capitulated to Bourbons.
 Suvóroff defeated Macdonald and overthrew the Italian republics.
Battle of Aboukir: French victory in Egypt over Turks.
 Allies took Mantua.
Battle of Novi: French routed: Joubert killed.
 British force landed in Holland under Duke of York.
Battle of Bergen: British and Russians defeated in Holland.
Battle of Zürich: Russians defeated by

A.D.

- Masséna: Suvóroff driven out of Switzerland.
 1799. Bonaparte deserted Egyptian army, leaving Kléber in command, and landed in France.
Convention of Alkmaar: Britain to evacuate Holland.
 18 BRUMAIRE: Directory overthrown by Bonaparte.
 CONSULATE ESTABLISHED in France: Bonaparte, Cambacérès, and Lebrun consuls.
 British took Surinam from Dutch.
 Repressive legislation in Britain against combinations and corresponding societies.

NAPOLEON: A.D. 1800-1815

1800. Robert Owen at New Lanark.
Treaty of El Arish between Kléber and the Turks: French to evacuate Egypt.
 Pius VII became Pope.
Battle of Heliopolis: Kléber defeated the Turks.
 Godoy restored in Spain at instance of Napoleon.
 Napoleon crossed the Great St. Bernard Pass into Italy: occupied Milan.
 Masséna capitulated in Genoa.
 Assassination of Kléber in Egypt.
Battle of Marengo: Austrian victory turned into French victory by Desaix, who was killed.
Battle of Hochstädt: Moreau defeated Austrians under Kray.
 British captured Malta.
Battle of Hohenlinden: Moreau defeated Austrians under Archduke John.
 Second Armed Neutrality: Russia, Sweden, Denmark, and Prussia.
 UNION OF BRITAIN AND IRELAND: abolition of Irish Parliament.
 Jefferson elected President of United States.
 1801. British embargo on Russian, Danish, and Swedish vessels in British ports
 Toussaint L'Ouverture master of San Domingo.
 Pitt resigned: Addington became Premier.
 Peace of Lunéville between France and Austria: France gained Belgium, Luxemburg, Piedmont, &c.

1801. Kingdom of Etruria founded by Napoleon in Tuscany.
Treaty of Florence between France and Naples.
Battle of Alexandria: Abercromby defeated French, but killed: Cairo surrendered to British: French evacuated Egypt.
 Paul I murdered: Alexander I Tsar.
 Danish embargo on British ships in Danish ports.
Battle of Copenhagen: Parker and Nelson destroyed Danish fleet.
 Constitution of Malmaison imposed on Switzerland by France.
Treaty of Badajos between Spain and Portugal: Napoleon angry.
Treaty of St. Petersburg between Russia and Britain.
 Denmark accepted Russo-British Treaty.
 Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme*: a Catholic revival.
 1802. Cisalpine Republic called Italian Republic.
 PEACE OF AMIENS: an unstable settlement.
 Sweden accepted Brito-Russian treaty.
 Concordat between Napoleon and the Pope.
 Legion of Honour created.
 Constitution of the Year X: NAPOLEON FIRST CONSUL FOR LIFE (Aug. 4).
 France annexed Piedmont.
 Treaty between France and Russia.
 Ney sent to crush Switzerland.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.

1802. Treaty of Bassein between Britain and the Peshwa: led to Second Mahratta War.
Edinburgh Review founded: organ of Whigs.
 First British Factory Act.
 First practical steamboat: Symington's *Charlotte Dundas*.
 1803. Act of Mediation replaced Helvetic Republic by a Swiss Confederation.
 New Imperial Constitution.
 Britain declared war against France.
 Robert Emmet, Irish rebel, hanged.
Battles of Assaye and Argaum: Wellington's victories in India in Second Mahratta War.
 United States bought Louisiana from Napoleon, who had taken it from Spain.
 1804. Death of Immanuel Kant, great philosopher.
 Napoleon's legal legislation.
 Duc d'Enghien shot.
 Pitt again Prime Minister.
 EMPIRE ESTABLISHED IN FRANCE: Napoleon Emperor.
 Execution of Cadoudal and others for conspiracy in Paris.
 Napoleon made Spain declare war against Britain.
 Revolt of Servia against Turkey: Kara George elected leader.
 1805. Melville impeached for peculation as Treasurer of the Navy.
 Napoleon crowned himself King of Italy at Milan.
 Ligurian Republic annexed to France.
Battle of Finisterre: Franco-Spanish fleet under Villeneuve defeated by Calder.
 Russo-Austrian Treaty.
 Parma and Piacenza annexed to France.
 Capitulation of Austrian general Mack in Ulm.
Battle of Trafalgar: Nelson destroyed Franco-Spanish fleet, but killed.
 Napoleon entered Vienna.
Battle of Austerlitz: Napoleon defeated Austro-Russian army.
 Treaty of Vienna between France and Prussia: Prussia to get Hanover.
 Peace of Pressburg between France and Austria: Bavaria and Württemberg became kingdoms: Austria lost Venice and Tyrol.

A.D.

1805. Sir Walter Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel*.
 Death of Schiller.
 1806. Death of Pitt: Ministry of All the Talents formed under Grenville and including Fox.
 New Treaty between France and Prussia.
 Venetia annexed to Kingdom of Italy.
 Joseph Bonaparte declared King of the Two Sicilies.
 Prussia annexed Hanover.
 Prussia compelled to exclude British ships from Prussian ports: Britain declared war against Prussia.
 Louis Bonaparte became King of Holland.
 British occupied Buenos Aires, but forced by townspeople to surrender.
Battle of Maida: British defeated French in South Italy.
 Confederation of the Rhine formed by Napoleon: the confederated states seceded from the Empire.
 Francis II resigned the Empire and became Francis I, Emperor of Austria: END OF HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE.
 Death of Fox.
 Prussian ultimatum to Napoleon.
Battle of Jena: Napoleon defeated Prussia.
Battle of Auerstädt: Davout defeated Prussia.
 French occupation of Berlin: Prussia subdued.
 Napoleon's Berlin Decrees against Britain: THE CONTINENTAL SYSTEM.
 Murat occupied Warsaw.
 Treaty of Posen: Saxony joined Confederation of the Rhine and became a kingdom.
 Russia reduced Bucharest.
 1807. British Order in Council in reply to Berlin Decree.
Battle of Eylau: Napoleon against the Russians: indecisive.
 Tory ministry of Portland and Perceval.
 Bill passed by British Parliament abolishing the slave trade.
 Selim III of Turkey dethroned: Mustafa IV Sultan.
 Britain acceded to Convention of Bartenstein to help Prussia and Sweden.
Battle of Friedland: Napoleon defeated the Russians.

A.D.

1807. TREATY OF TILSIT between France and Russia.
 British bombardment of Copenhagen: Danish fleet surrendered.
 Serfdom abolished in Prussia.
 Convention of Fontainebleau between Napoleon and Spain for partition of Portugal.
 Russian breach with Britain.
 French troops crossed into Spain.
 Flight of Portuguese royal family to Brazil.
Fichte's Reden an die deutsche Nation: Prussian national revival.
 British captured Montevideo and then receded it.
 Kingdom of Westphalia founded by Napoleon for Jerome.
 1808. French seized Pampeluna and Barcelona.
 Russia invaded Finland.
 Joachim Murat became King of Naples.
 Charles IV of Spain abdicated: Ferdinand VII became King.
 French under Murat in Madrid.
 National insurrection in Spain.
 Etrurian kingdom annexed to France.
 Papal States partly annexed to Kingdom of Italy.
 Joseph Bonaparte made King of Spain.
 Palafox's defence of Saragossa: French repelled.
 French failed against Valencia.
 Capitulation of French at Baylen.
 Mahmud II Sultan of Turkey after murder of Mustafa IV.
 Joseph evacuated Madrid.
 British force landed in Portugal under Wellington.
Battle of Vimiero: Wellington defeated Junot.
 Convention of Cintra: French evacuated Portugal.
 Convention of Erfurt: Napoleon and Russia.
 Napoleon took Madrid.
 Frederick VI King of Denmark.
 Second siege of Saragossa (surrendered next year).
 Madison elected President of United States.
 Goethe completed first part of *Faust.*
 VOL. IV.

A.D.

1809. Peace of the Dardanelles between Britain and Turkey.
Battle of Corunna: Moore defeated Soult, but killed.
 Soult took Oporto.
Battle of Medellin: French under Victor defeated Spanish.
 Deposition of Gustavus IV of Sweden: Charles XIII succeeded.
Battle of Abensberg: Napoleon defeated Austrians.
 Austrians occupied Warsaw for a time.
Battle of Eckmühl: Napoleon defeated Archduke Charles.
 Wellington drove Soult out of Portugal.
 Napoleon in Vienna.
 Napoleon annexed Rome and Papal States to French Empire: Pius VII a prisoner.
Battle of Aspern: Napoleon defeated by Archduke Charles: Lannes killed.
 Andreas Hofer and the Tyrolese took Innsbruck.
Battle of Wagram: Napoleon defeated Austrians.
Battle of Talavera: French under Victor defeated by Wellington.
 British Walcheren expedition: a failure.
 Revolts in Quito and other places in Spanish South America.
 Treaty of Fredrikshamn: Sweden ceded Finland to Russia.
 Peace of Schönbrunn between France and Austria.
Battle of Ocaña: Spaniards defeated by French.
Battle of Alba de Tormes: Spaniards defeated.
 French took Gerona after long siege.
 Treaty of Jonköping ended war between Sweden and Denmark.
 Perceval became Prime Minister.
Quarterly Review founded: organ of Tories.
 Lamarck originated modern evolutionary doctrine.
 1810. Treaty between Sweden and France: Sweden adopted the Continental System.
 Napoleon divorced Josephine.
 Soult took Seville.
 Andreas Hofer shot.
 Caracas Junta appointed in South America.

A.D.

1810. Revolution in Buenos Aires.
 Holland annexed to France.
 Ney took Ciudad Rodrigo.
 Masséna invaded Portugal.
Battle of Busaco: Wellington defeated Masséna.
 Coimbra with its garrison taken by British.
 Wellington retired behind the lines of Torres Vedras.
Fontainebleau Decrees by Napoleon against British goods.
 France annexed north-western Germany.
 A. W. Schlegel's German translation of Shakespeare.
1811. French took Tortosa.
 France annexed Duchy of Oldenburg: led to breach with Russia.
 Soult took Badajoz.
 Masséna retreated from Portugal.
Battle of Fuentes d'Oñoro: Masséna failed against Wellington.
 Wellington took Almeida.
Battle of Albuera: Beresford defeated Soult.
 Caracas Congress proclaimed independence of Spain.
Battle of Sagunto: Suchet defeated Spaniards.
 Massacre of the Mamelukes: Mehemet Ali supreme in Egypt.
 Chilean revolution.
1812. French took Valencia.
 Napoleon occupied Swedish Pomerania.
 Wellington took Ciudad Rodrigo.
 Caracas destroyed by earthquake.
 Wellington took Badajoz.
 Assassination of Perceval: Liverpool became Prime Minister.
 Treaty of Bucharest between Russia and Turkey.
 Napoleon invaded Russia (June 24).
 Revolutionists capitulated under Miranda in Caracas.
Battle of Salamanca: Wellington defeated Marmont.
 Wellington entered Madrid.
Battle of the Borodino: Napoleon against the Russians under Kutusoff: drawn.
 Napoleon entered Moscow (Sept. 14): city in flames.

A.D.

1812. Napoleon evacuated Moscow (Oct. 18).
 Crossing of the Berezina (Nov. 26).
 Napoleon in Paris (Dec. 19) ahead of the remnant of his army.
 War between Britain and United States.
1813. Russians invaded Germany.
 Alliance between Russia and Prussia.
Treaty of Stockholm between Sweden and Britain.
Battle of Gross-Görschen: Napoleon defeated Russians and Prussians.
Battle of Bautzen: Napoleon defeated the Russians and Prussians.
 Armistice of Pläiswitz concluded at instance of Napoleon.
 Treaty of Reichenbach.
Battle of Vittoria: Wellington defeated Jourdan and Joseph Bonaparte.
 French took Vilna.
Battles of the Pyrenees: Wellington defeated Soult.
 Bolívar entered Caracas as Libertador.
 Austria declared war against Napoleon (August 12).
Battle of Gross-Beeren: French defeated by Prussians.
Battle of Katsbach: Blücher defeated Napoleon.
Battle of Dresden: Napoleon defeated the Allies.
Battle of Kulm: Allies defeated French.
Battle of Dennewitz: Prussians defeated Ney.
 Turks reconquered Servia: Kara George fled.
 Wellington took San Sebastian.
Battle of Leipzig (Battle of the Nations) (Oct. 16-19): Napoleon defeated by the Allies: Leipzig taken.
 Wellington took Pamplona.
Battles of the Nive: Wellington defeated Soult.
 Treaty of Valençay: Napoleon gave crown of Spain to Ferdinand.
 Wellington invaded France (Dec. 22).
1814. *Battle of La Rothière:* Blücher defeated Napoleon.
 Treaty of Kiel: Denmark surrendered Norway to Sweden.
 Cortes of Spain forbade recognition of Ferdinand until he should swear to the Constitution.
Battle of Orthes: Wellington beat Soult.

A.D.

1814. *Battle of Laon*: Allies defeated Napoleon.
 Treaty of Chaumont between Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Britain.
 Allies occupied Paris (March 31).
Battle of Toulouse: Wellington defeated Soult (April 10).
 Abdication of Napoleon (April 11).
 Treaty of Fontainebleau accepted by Napoleon: banished to Elba (April 13).
 Louis XVIII entered Paris (May 3).
 Ferdinand of Spain issued proclamation against the Constitution: Liberal deputies arrested.
 First Peace of Paris (May 30).
 Fall of Montevideo.
 Bolívar heavily defeated: abandoned Caracas.
 Society of Jesus reconstituted by the Pope Pius VII.
 Congress of Vienna opened.
 Peruvian invasion overthrew Chilian Republic.
 Hetairia Philike founded at Odessa: Greek national movement begun.
 Treaty of Ghent ended war between Britain and the United States.
 Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley*.
 1815. Napoleon landed in France (March 5): the HUNDRED DAYS begun.
 Napoleon declared by Congress of Vienna "the enemy and disturber of the peace of the world".
 William I of Holland became King of the Netherlands.

A.D.

1815. Louis XVIII fled from Paris (March 19) and Napoleon entered next day.
 Second Servian revolt against Turkey: under Milosh Obrenovitch.
 Spanish force landed at Cumaná in South America under Morillo.
 Brazil declared a separate kingdom.
Battle of Tolentino: Murat overthrown in Italy.
 Revolt in the Vendée.
Battle of St. Gilles: Vendéans defeated and La Rochejaquin killed.
 FINAL ACT OF CONGRESS OF VIENNA (June 9).
Battle of Quatre-Bras: Wellington defeated Ney (June 16).
Battle of Ligny: Blücher defeated after hard fight (June 16).
 BATTLE OF WATERLOO: Napoleon defeated by Wellington and Blücher (June 18).
 Abdication of Napoleon (June 22).
 Allies entered Paris (July 7): Louis XVIII restored next day.
 Richelieu Prime Minister of France.
 Napoleon surrendered to the British (July 15): St. Helena.
 Holy Alliance between Russia, Austria, and Prussia.
 Concert of Europe established between Britain, Russia, Prussia, and Austria.
 Alexander I granted a Polish constitution.
 Morillo invaded New Granada: Bolívar fled.
 First Corn Law passed in Britain.

THE AGE OF METTERNICH: A.D. 1816-1848

1816. Death of mad Queen Maria I of Portugal: John VI proclaimed King of Portugal, Brazil, and the Algarves.
 Independence of the Argentine provinces proclaimed.
 Radical meeting at Spa Fields broken up.
 Luddite anti-machinery riots.
 Monroe elected President of United States.
 1817. *Battle of Chacabuco*: San Martín defeated the Royalists in S. America.
 Seditious Meetings Act in Britain passed by Castlereagh, suspending Habeas Corpus Act.
 Bolívar captured Angostura.

1817. Servian autonomy recognized by Turkey.
 Ali Pasha of Janina at the height of his power.
 Acquittal of Hone.
 Ricardo's *Principles of Political Economy*.
 1818. *Battle of Maipú*: San Martín won Chilian independence.
 Charles XIV (Bernadotte) became King of Sweden and Norway.
 Prussia became a free-trade area.
 Bavaria obtained a constitution: also Baden.
 Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle: France admitted to the Concert.

A.D.

1818. Decazes chief minister in France.
End of last Mahratta War in India: Mahratta power completely destroyed.
1819. Radical meeting at Bonnymuir dispersed.
Treaty of Frankfort completed work of Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle.
Peterloo Massacre near Manchester.
Carlsbad Decrees: reaction in Germany.
The Six Acts in Britain restricting right of meeting, &c.
Bolivar occupied Bogotá.
Cash payments resumed in Britain.
Joseph de Maistre's Du Pape: beginning of Ultramontanism.
1820. Spanish Revolution broke out.
George IV became King of Britain.
Murder of the Duke of Berry in France.
Fall of Decazes in France: Richelieu again chief minister.
Cato Street Conspiracy against the Cabinet discovered: Thistlewood and others executed.
Ferdinand of Spain decided to adopt the Constitution of 1812.
Revolt in Naples.
Congress of Troppau: Britain and France dissented from the reactionary protocol.
Failure of George IV's Divorce Bill.
Democratic insurrection in Lisbon.
The Missouri Compromise on the slavery question in the United States.
1821. Congress of Laibach.
Prince Ypsilanti invaded Moldavia to rouse the Greeks against Turkey.
Battle of Rieti: Neapolitan constitutionalists defeated by Austrians.
Revolt in Piedmont.
Greek revolt in the Morea.
Patriarch Gregorius and two Bishops hanged by Turks.
John VI returned from Brazil to Lisbon.
Death of Napoleon (May 5).
Greeks under Ypsilanti defeated in Wallachia.
San Martín entered Lima and proclaimed independence of Peru.
Battle of Carabobo: Bolivar defeated the Royalist forces and occupied Caracas.
Richelieu resigned in France: Royalist reaction under Villèle.
Iturbide declared for an independent Mexican empire.

A.D.

1821. Mehemet Ali began conquest of Soudan.
Death of Keats.
1822. Massacre in Scio by the Turks.
Lima occupied by the Royalists.
Battle of Pichincha: Sucre freed Quito.
Iturbide proclaimed Emperor of Mexico.
United States recognized national independence of Colombia, Chile, Buenos Aires, and Mexico.
Dom Pedro proclaimed Emperor of Brazil.
Suicide of Castlereagh: Canning succeeded him.
Brazil declared an independent empire.
Congress of Verona: Britain dissented from coercion of Spain.
Ali Pasha surrendered to the Turks and murdered.
Death of Shelley.
1823. France, Russia, Austria, and Prussia demanded the abolition of 1812 Constitution in Spain.
Louis XVIII declared war against Spanish rebels.
Britain recognized the Greeks as belligerents.
The French invaded Spain, and entered Madrid.
Bolivar entered Lima.
Leo XII became Pope.
President Monroe's message: beginning of MONROE DOCTRINE.
Iturbide abdicated in Mexico owing to military revolt of Santa Ana.
1824. Mehemet Ali took part against the Greeks.
Dom Miguel assumed government of Portugal, but compelled by the Powers to withdraw.
Conference of St. Petersburg on Eastern Question between Russia and Austria.
Battle of Junín: Bolivar victorious.
Charles X King of France.
Battle of Ayacucho: Sucre decisively defeated Royalists.
Laws against combinations repealed in Britain.
John Quincy Adams elected President of United States.
Westminster Review started: organ of Radicals.
Death of Byron in Greece.
1825. Britain recognized independence of Buenos Aires, Colombia, and Mexico.

A.D.

1825. Ibrahim, son of Mehemet Ali, landed in Morea to help Turkey.
 Consecration of Charles X at Reims.
 Nicholas I became Tsar.
 December rising in Russia suppressed.
 Financial crisis in Britain.
 Navigation Laws partly repealed.
 STOCKTON AND DARLINGTON RAILWAY OPENED.
1826. Chiloe, last Royalist stronghold in America, fell.
 Death of John VI of Portugal.
 Russian ultimatum to Turkey demanding evacuation of principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia.
 Protocol of St. Petersburg regarding Greece: between Britain and Russia.
 End of defence of Missolonghi.
 Revolt of the Janissaries in Constantinople crushed.
 Chief Decembrists hanged in Russia.
 Massacre of the Janissaries in Constantinople.
 Jesuits returned to France.
 Treaty of Akkerman: Turkey agreed to Russian demands.
1827. Canning became Premier: Whig coalition.
 Press Censorship established in France.
 Treaty of London regarding Greece: between Britain, Russia, and France.
 Death of Canning: Goderich Prime Minister.
Battle of Navarino: Turkish fleet destroyed by allied fleet under Codrington.
 Martignac chief minister in France.
 Turkey denounced Treaty of Akkerman.
 Death of Beethoven.
 Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi*.
1828. Capodistrias elected Greek President.
 Wellington became Prime Minister.
 Dom Miguel landed at Lisbon as Regent.
 Russia invaded Turkey.
 Dom Miguel took title of King of Portugal: reign of terror.
 Protocol of London: Britain, France, and Russia.
 Ibrahim evacuated the Morea.
 Repeal of Test and Corporation Acts.
 O'Connell elected for Clare.
1828. Jackson elected President of United States.
 Pius VIII became Pope.
 Polignac became chief minister in France.
 Catholic Emancipation Act passed in Britain.
 Treaty of Adrianople between Russia and Turkey: Greece recognized as independent: Servian autonomy secured: Danubian principalities practically independent states.
 Fourth marriage of Ferdinand of Spain (to Maria Christina of Naples): beginning of Carlist movement.
 Garrison began the abolitionist movement in United States.
 The Rainhill locomotive trials: victory of George Stephenson's *Rocket*.
1830. Victor Hugo's *Hernani*.
 William IV became King of Britain.
 The JULY REVOLUTION in Paris: Louis Philippe became King.
 Belgian revolt against Holland: Belgian provinces proclaimed their independence.
 Wellington succeeded by Earl Grey as Prime Minister.
 Algiers captured by France.
 Insurrection in Poland.
 Milosh hereditary prince of Servia.
 Conference of London recognized Belgian independence.
1831. Polish Diet declared the Romanoffs excluded from the sovereignty.
 Gregory XVI became Pope.
 Revolution in the Papal States.
Battle of Grochow: Russians defeated Poles.
 Casimir Périer ministry in France.
 Second Reading of first Reform Bill carried in House of Commons by majority of 1 (March 21); hostile amendment carried (April); Parliament dissolved (April 22); majority for Reform elected.
 Austrian troops helped Pope to suppress rising in Bologna.
 Abdication of Pedro I in Brazil; Pedro II succeeded.
 Leopold of Saxe-Coburg elected as Leopold I, King of the Belgians.
 French squadron in the Tagus: Portuguese fleet surrendered.
 Dutch invasion of Belgium.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.	A.D.
1831. Assassination of Capodistrias.	Treaty of Berlin between Austria, Prussia, and Russia.
Polish revolution crushed: the kingdom ended.	<i>Tracts for the Times</i> began Oxford Movement.
House of Lords rejected first Reform Bill in its second form (Oct. 8).	<i>Sartor Resartus</i> by Thomas Carlyle.
Mehemet Ali invaded Syria: siege of Acre.	1834. Treaty between Britain, Spain, Portugal, and France: Austria, Russia, and Prussia became Carlist.
Charles Albert became King of Sardinia.	<i>Battle of Asseiceira</i> : Miguelists finally defeated by Pedrolists in Portugal: Maria II established as Queen.
Young Italy founded by Mazzini.	Poor Law Act in England.
Death of Hegel.	Grey resigned: Melbourne became Premier.
1832. Kingdom of Greece erected by Convention of London: Otho of Bavaria became King.	William IV dismissed Melbourne and summoned Peel.
British Cabinet recommended creation of peers to pass Reform Bill: King William IV refused: Wellington failed to form a ministry: King then agreed: Lords passed the Bill.	Beginning of Robert Owen's Socialist propaganda.
Ibrahim took Acre.	The Veto Act passed by the Scottish General Assembly.
FIRST REFORM ACT PASSED (June 7).	1835. Ferdinand I became Emperor of Austria.
Ibrahim took Damascus.	Carlists failed to capture Bilbao.
Pedro's expedition landed in Portugal.	Peel resigned: Melbourne recalled.
Ibrahim conquered all Syria.	Municipal Reform Act.
The Pope condemned the teaching of Lamennais.	Electric telegraph invented.
Soult ministry in France, including the doctrinaires (Guizot, Thiers, &c.).	1836. Thiers ministry in France: then Guizot ministry.
Antwerp capitulated to French.	Bilbao again relieved by Espartero from Carlist attack.
<i>Battle of Konieh</i> : Ibrahim defeated Turks.	Orange Lodges dissolved.
General Election: Whig triumph.	Beginning of Chartist movement.
Crete placed under Egypt.	Beginning of Great Trek of Boers in S. Africa.
Death of Goethe.	Van Buren elected President in United States.
Death of Scott.	1837. Molé ministry in France.
Death of Bentham.	Victoria Queen of Britain: Hanover became a separate kingdom under Ernest Augustus.
1833. Russian squadron in the Bosphorus.	Seven professors expelled from Göttingen by Ernest Augustus for protest against unconstitutionalism.
Convention of Kutaya: Mehemet Ali recognized by Turkey as Pasha of Syria, &c.	Rebellion in Canada under Papineau and Mackenzie.
<i>Battle of Cape St. Vincent</i> : Napier destroyed the Miguelist fleet.	Death of Pushkin, Russian poet.
Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi: alliance between Russia and Turkey.	<i>Pickwick Papers</i> of Charles Dickens.
Terceira defeated Miguelists near Lisbon.	1838. Massacre of Boers by Zulu chief Dingan.
Siege of Oporto raised by Miguelists.	People's Charter published.
Dom Pedro entered Lisbon.	Anti-Corn Law League founded by Cobden and Bright.
Death of Ferdinand of Spain: succeeded by his daughter Isabella II.	Dingan's Day: Boer revenge on Zulus.
Convention of Münchengrätz between Russia, Austria, and Prussia in aid of Turkey (secret).	
Act for Emancipation of British colonial slaves.	

1839. Durham's Report on Canada submitted to British Parliament.
- War renewed between Sultan of Turkey and Mehemet Ali: Sultan's army invaded Syria.
- Soult ministry in France.
- Treaty of London: final adjustment of Belgian frontiers and recognition by Holland.
- Battle of Nesib*: Ibrahim's decisive victory over the Turks.
- Abdul Mejid became Sultan of Turkey.
- Prince Milosh abdicated in Servia.
- French conquest of Algeria completed.
- Peel Premier: resigned on Bedchamber question: Melbourne resumed office.
- First Afghan War began (ended 1842).
- Christian VIII King of Denmark.
1840. Penny postage introduced in Britain.
- Treaty of Waitangi between Captain Hobson and Maori chiefs.
- Thiers ministry in France.
- O'Connell revived the Repeal Association.
- End of the Carlist war in Spain.
- Frederick William IV King of Prussia.
- Convention of London: four Powers to act against Mehemet Ali: France stood aloof.
- Reactionary constitution imposed in Hanover.
- Beirut bombarded by Sir Charles Napier.
- Christina abdicated the Regency in Spain.
- Resignation of Thiers.
- Crete restored to Turkey.
- Acre taken by allied fleet.
- UNION ACT for Canada: responsible government granted: an epoch in colonial history.
- End of convict transportation to New South Wales.
- War between Britain and China on opium question.
- Abdication of William I in Holland: William II succeeded.
- Harrison elected President of United States.
- Livingstone began his work in Africa.
1841. Mehemet Ali submitted to Sultan: became hereditary Pasha of Egypt.
- Esparrero became Spanish Regent.
1841. Melbourne, defeated after a dissolution, resigned: Peel became Premier.
- Tyler became President of United States on death of Harrison.
- Hong Kong ceded to Britain by China.
1842. Death of Duke of Orleans: Regency Act in France.
- The Nation* began in Dublin.
- Alexander Karageorgevich became Prince of Servia.
- Claim of Right by Scottish Church.
- Treaty between Britain and China: several ports opened.
1843. *Entente cordiale* between France and Britain.
- Free Church founded in Scotland by the DISRUPTION: Dr. Chalmers the leader.
- Natal declared British.
- Battle of Miani*: Napier conquered Sind.
- Counter-revolution in Spain: flight of Esparrero: Narvaez in power.
1844. Oscar I King of Sweden and Norway.
- France annexed Tahiti.
- Otto compelled to grant a constitution in Greece.
- Railway Act.
- German Catholics founded by Ronge.
- Bank Charter Act.
- Polk elected President of United States.
1845. Catholic Sonderbund formed in Switzerland.
- Failure of the potato crop: great distress in Ireland, &c.
- Lord John Russell failed to form a ministry.
- First Sikh War.
1846. Pius IX became Pope.
- REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS.
- Defeat and resignation of Peel: Russell formed a ministry.
- Entente cordiale* between Britain and France broken off on question of Spanish marriages.
- Austria absorbed Cracow.
- War between United States and Mexico, due to annexation of Texas by former.
1847. Lord Elgin Governor of Canada: made responsible government a reality.
- Austrian occupation of Ferrara.
- Federal Diet in Switzerland declared dissolution of Sonderbund.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.

1847. Swiss Federal general Dufour took Fribourg and Lucerne and crushed the Sonderbund.
 Ten Hours Act in Britain.
 Mexico occupied by United States troops.
 French defeated and captured Abd-el-Kader in Algeria.
Vanity Fair by Thackeray.
1848. Austrians crushed disturbances in Milan, &c.
 Rising in Palermo: Sicily soon freed, except fortress of Messina.
 Constitutional edict in Naples.
 Frederick VII King of Denmark.
 Orange River Sovereignty named by Sir Harry Smith.
 Demand for a German National Parliament formulated in Baden Chamber.
 Constitution granted in Tuscany.
FEBRUARY REVOLUTION IN PARIS: Republic proclaimed: Lamartine a leader.
 Guizot dismissed.
 Louis Philippe abdicated.
 Neuchâtel proclaimed a Republic.
 Constitution granted in Piedmont.
 Insurrection in Vienna: resignation and flight of Metternich: **END OF ABSOLUTIST REACTION.**
 Constitution granted in Rome: Republic proclaimed, with Mazzini at its head.
 Hungary gained the People's Charter: virtual autonomy.
 Successful insurrection in Berlin.
 Successful revolution in Milan.
 Venice rose under Manin and proclaimed a Republic.
 Charles Albert invaded Lombardy (March 25).
 Tuscany declared war against Austria.
 Chartist demonstration in London a fiasco.
 Tuscan forces invaded Lombardy.
 Pope disclaimed the Italian cause.
 Prussia occupied Schleswig and invaded Jutland.
 Neapolitan constitution dropped.
1848. Flight of Emperor Ferdinand.
 German National Assembly at Frankfort.
Battle of Goito: Piedmontese victory over Austrians.
 Radetzky overran Venetia.
 National Workshops in Paris: soon abolished.
 Cavaignac suppressed a Paris insurrection.
 Archduke John elected Reichsverweser by Frankfort Assembly.
 Reichstag met at Vienna.
Battle of Custozza: Charles Albert defeated by Radetzky.
 Union of Venetia and Piedmont declared: soon overthrown.
 Radetzky reoccupied Milan.
 Salasco armistice.
 Truce of Malmoe between Denmark and Prussia.
Battle of Boomplatz: Boers defeated by Sir Harry Smith.
 New Swiss Federal constitution.
 Hungary invaded by Jellachich, Ban of Croatia.
 Austria declared war against Hungary.
 Vienna again in revolution.
Battle of Schwechat: defeat and retreat of Hungarian army.
 Vienna fell to Windischgrätz.
 New Dutch constitution.
 Flight of Pius IX to Gaeta.
 Ferdinand forced to abdicate: Francis Joseph became Austrian Emperor.
 Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte elected President of France for four years.
 Second Sikh War broke out in India: Punjab annexed.
 Transportation of leaders of Young Ireland.
 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ceded New Mexico, California, and Texas from Mexico to the United States.
 Gold discovered in California.
 Taylor elected President of United States.

THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALITY: A.D. 1849-1870

A.D.

1849. *Battle of Kápolna*: Hungarians defeated in bloody battle.
 William III King of Holland.
Battle of Novara: Radetzky defeated Charles Albert.
Battle of Chillianwala: Gough defeated the Sikhs.
Battle of Gujrat: Gough crushed the Sikhs.
 Punjab annexed to British India.
 Charles Albert abdicated in favour of Victor Emmanuel II.
 Frankfort Assembly chose King of Prussia as German Emperor: King of Prussia declined.
 Schleswig-Holstein War re-opened.
 Twenty-eight German States accepted the Frankfort Constitution of the Empire.
 Hungary declared itself a republic, at instance of Kossuth.
 Prussia rejected the Frankfort Constitution.
 French under Oudinot landed in Italy to suppress Roman Republic: Garibaldi repelled them at first, but Rome fell.
 Russia helped Austria to suppress Hungarian revolution.
 Revolt in Bavarian Palatinate.
 Prussians suppressed revolt in Dresden.
 Revolt in Baden: Provisional Government formed.
 Sicilian revolution crushed by Naples.
 Haynau's brutality at Brescia.
 Austrians entered Florence.
 Garibaldi repulsed the Neapolitans.
 Hungarians under Görgei took Budapest.
 Windischgrätz suppressed the Prague insurrection.
 Austrians took Budapest.
 Prussians suppressed Baden revolution.
Battle of Segesvár: Hungarians under Bem routed.
 Death of Mehemet Ali: Abbas I succeeded in Egypt.
Battle of Szörreg: Haynau defeated Hungarians.
Battle of Temesvar: Haynau completely defeated Hungarians.
1849. Abdication and flight of Kossuth.
 Surrender of Görgei and a Hungarian army at Világos.
 Venice surrendered to Austrians.
 Flight of Pope to Gaeta.
 Complete repeal of Navigation Laws in Britain.
1850. Erfurt Parliament called by Prussia.
 Saxony and Hanover withdrew from the Three Kings' League.
 Pius IX returned to Rome.
 Dispute between Greece and Britain over Don Pacifico.
 Peace of Berlin ended Schleswig-Holstein War.
 Death of Peel.
 Cavour Prime Minister in Piedmont.
 Olmütz "Punctuation": Austria and Prussia adjusted Hesse-Cassel question.
 Fillmore became President of United States on death of Taylor.
Tennyson's In Memoriam.
1851. Secret Alliance between Austria and Prussia.
 First Australian goldfield opened.
 Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état* in France: victorious on a plebiscite.
 Palmerston dismissed from Foreign Office for unauthorized recognition of the French *coup d'état*.
 Austrian constitution abolished.
 Catholic hierarchy restored in Britain and Holland.
 The Great Exhibition in London.
 Death of Turner, the painter.
1852. Sand River Convention: Britain recognized independence of Transvaal.
 Russell defeated: Derby Prime Minister.
 Hereditary Empire restored in France: Louis Napoleon became Napoleon III (Nov. 22).
 Enrico Tazzoli hanged in Italy: "Mantuan Trials".
 Annexation of Lower Burma by Britain.
 Fall of Derby ministry.
 Pierce elected President of United States.
Uncle Tom's Cabin by Mrs. Stowe.
1853. Montenegrins defeated Turkish expedition against them.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.

1853. American naval commander Perry in Japan.
 Pedro V King of Portugal.
 "Massacre" of Sinope.
 Aberdeen coalition ministry in Britain.
 Orange River Sovereignty abandoned by Britain.
 1854. German Zollverein practically complete.
 Orange Free State established.
 British and French troops occupied the Piræus.
 Said Pasha ruler of Egypt.
 Revolt in Madrid: Espartero became Premier.
 British and French troops landed in the Crimea: beginning of CRIMEAN WAR.
Battle of the Alma: Russians defeated.
 Siege of Sebastopol began.
Battle of Balaklava: drawn: Charge of the Light Brigade.
Battle of Inkermann: Russians defeated.
 Dogma of the Immaculate Conception promulgated.
 Ecclesiastical Titles Bill in Britain: abortive.
 Missouri Compromise repealed in United States.
 1855. Sardinia joined Britain and France in Crimean War.
 Alexander II Tsar of Russia.
 Aberdeen defeated and resigned: Palmerston Premier.
 Fall of Sebastopol.
 1856. Treaty of Paris ended Crimean War.
 Annexation of Oude to British India.
 Buchanan elected President of United States.
 1857. Arrow incident in China led to war: Palmerston defeated in Parliament: appealed to the country and obtained a majority.
 Outbreak of Indian Mutiny at Meerut.
 Prussia gave up suzerainty over Neuchâtel.
 Massacre of Cawnpore.
 Havelock's relief of Lucknow.
 British took Delhi palace.
 Campbell relieved Lucknow.
 Bank Charter Act suspended.
 1858. Orsini's attempt on life of Napoleon III.
 Occupation of Lucknow.

A.D.

1853. Treaty of Aigun: Russia obtained from China a large part of Amur basin.
 Cavour and Napoleon III met at Plombières.
 Sir Hugh Rose took Gwalior.
 United States treaty with Japan.
 Government of India transferred to the Crown: title of Viceroy given to Lord Canning.
 Palmerston defeated on Orsini question: Derby Premier.
 1859. Milosh restored as Prince of Servia.
 War between Austria and Piedmont: Austria invaded Piedmont.
Battle of Montebello: Austrians defeated by Piedmontese.
Battle of Palestro: Austrians defeated by Piedmontese.
Battle of Magenta: French defeated Austrians and freed Milan.
Battle of Melgnano: French defeated Austrians.
Battle of Solferino: Austrians defeated by French and Piedmontese.
 Palmerston again Premier.
 Peace of Villafranca between France and Austria: Lombardy won for Italy.
 The duchies declared for union with Piedmont.
 Union of Moldavia and Wallachia under Prince Cuza: joint state became known as Roumania.
 Spain at war with Morocco.
 Treaty of Zürich completed the Villafranca peace.
 Volunteer movement arose in Britain.
 Charles XV King of Sweden and Norway.
 John Brown's attack on Harper's Ferry.
 Meredith's *Ordeal of Richard Feverel*.
 Darwin's *Origin of Species*.
 1860. Commercial Treaty between Britain and France negotiated by Richard Cobden.
 Tuscany and Emilia declared for union with Piedmont.
 Treaty of Turin between France and Piedmont: France given Nice and Savoy.
 Revolution in Sicily: Garibaldi landed.
Battle of Calatafimi: Garibaldi's victory.
 Garibaldi entered Palermo.

A.D.

1860. *Battle of Milazzo*: Garibaldi victorious.
 Garibaldi invaded Italy: entered Naples, from which Francis II had fled.
 Piedmontese army in Kingdom of Naples.
 Naples and Sicily voted for annexation to Piedmont.
 Meeting of Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel II: former saluted latter as King of Italy.
 Marches and Umbria voted for annexation to Piedmont.
 The Liberal Decrees in France.
 Michael became Prince of Servia.
 Treaty of Tientsin ended war in China: more ports opened.
 Lords rejected repeal of paper duties: Gladstone overcame their opposition.
 Lincoln elected President of United States.
 Secession of Southern States: CIVIL WAR in United States began.
 Ruskin completed *Modern Painters*.
 1861. William I became King of Prussia.
 Confederate States constituted in southern United States: Jefferson Davis President.
 Fall of Gaeta.
 First manifesto of serf emancipation in Russia.
 KINGDOM OF ITALY proclaimed (May 17).
 Fort Sumter capitulated to the Confederates: first shot in American Civil War.
 Death of Cavour.
 Lebanon constitution.
Battle of Bull Run: Federals defeated by Confederates.
 Abdul Aziz became Sultan of Turkey.
 France, Britain, and Spain intervened in Mexico.
 Luiz I King of Portugal.
 The *Trent Incident*: Mason and Slidell.
 1862. *Battle of Shiloh*: Confederates defeated by Halleck.
 New Orleans captured for the Federals by Farragut.
 French troops entered Mexico: Maximilian of Austria proclaimed Emperor.
Seven Days' Battles: Federal victories.
 Garibaldi at Palermo.
 The *Alabama* set out from Britain.
 Cotton famine in Lancashire.

A.D.

1862. Garibaldi invaded southern Italy.
Battle of Aspromonte: Garibaldi defeated and taken prisoner.
Second Battle of Bull Run: Confederates under Lee defeated Federals.
 Montenegrin war ended by Convention of Scutari.
 Speke and Grant discovered sources of the Nile.
 Bismarck became Prussian minister.
Battle of Antietam: Confederates under Lee and Federals under McClellan: drawn.
 Lincoln's first Emancipation Proclamation.
 King Otho deposed in Greece.
Battle of Fredericksburg: Federals under Burnside completely defeated.
 1863. *Battle of Murfreesborough*: Confederates defeated by Rosecrans.
 Revolution in Poland.
 Ismail Pasha succeeded in Egypt.
 New constitution proclaimed for Schleswig and Holstein: indignation in Germany.
 Prince William of Schleswig-Holstein elected King of Greece as George I.
Battle of Chancellorsville: Lee defeated Federals under Hooker: Stonewall Jackson killed.
Battle of Gettysburg: Lee defeated by Federals under Meade.
 Vicksburg captured for the Federals by Grant.
Battle of Chickamauga: Federals defeated in fierce battle.
 Christian IX King of Denmark.
Battle of Chattanooga: Confederates defeated by Grant.
 Saxon and Hanoverian troops invaded Holstein.
 Fenian Secret Society founded in Ireland to set up Irish republic.
 1864. War declared against Denmark by Prussia and Austria.
Battles of the Wilderness and Spotsylvania: indecisive struggles between Lee and Grant.
 Britain ceded the Ionian Islands to Greece.
Battle of Cold Harbour: Grant defeated by Lee.
 Russia completed subjugation of the Caucasus.
 Geneva Convention regarding sick and wounded in war.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.

1864. End of Taiping Rebellion in China.
 Danish government handed over Schleswig and Holstein to Prussia and Austria.
 Atlanta captured by Sherman.
 Pius IX issued the Bull *Quanta Cura* and the Syllabus: Papal war against modern enlightenment and progress.
Battle of Franklin: Confederates under Hood crushingly defeated.
Battle of Nashville: Hood crushingly defeated by Federals under Thomas.
 Sherman captured Savannah.
 International Working Men's Association founded in London.
1865. Richmond evacuated by the Confederates.
 Lee surrendered at Appomattox: end of American Civil War.
 Assassination of Lincoln: Johnson became President.
 Convention of Gastein between Prussia and Austria.
 Thirteenth Amendment of United States Constitution: slavery abolished.
 Leopold II King of the Belgians.
 Russell became Premier on Palmerston's death.
 Russia acquired Tashkend.
1866. Habeas Corpus Act suspended in Ireland.
 Treaty between Prussia and Italy.
 Austria declared war against Prussia.
 Italy declared war against Austria.
Battle of Custozza: Italians defeated by Austrians.
Battle of Lissa: naval defeat of Italians by Austrians.
 Hanoverians capitulated to Prussia.
 Gladstone introduced a Reform Bill: the Adullamites helped the Conservatives to defeat it: Derby ministry followed Russell's resignation.
Battle of Königgrätz (Sadowa): Austrians under Benedek defeated by Prussians.
 Preliminaries of Nikolsburg between Austria and Prussia.
 Treaty of Prague between Prussia and Austria ended Seven Weeks' War.
 Treaty of Vienna between Austria and Italy: Italy obtained Venetia.
 Prince Charles became ruler of Roumania.
 French withdrew from Rome.
- A.D.
1866. "Black Friday" in London: financial crisis.
 First Atlantic cable successfully laid.
 1867. Resignation of Lord Cranborne (afterwards Lord Salisbury) and others because of Disraeli's Reform Bill.
 Turkey agreed to withdraw her garrisons from Servia.
 French withdrew from Mexico.
 British North America Act created Dominion of Canada: BEGINNING OF FEDERATION IN THE EMPIRE.
 Luxemburg made neutral.
 Title of Khedive granted by Sultan to the Viceroy of Egypt.
 Maximilian shot in Mexico.
 North German Confederation formed.
 Russia sold Alaska to United States.
Battle of Mentana: French helped to defeat Garibaldi.
 → REFORM ACT passed as moulded by the Liberal majority.
 Fenian outrages in London, Manchester, &c.
 Karl Marx published *Das*.
1868. Shogunate abolished in Japan: Mikado resumed the government.
 Disraeli Premier on Derby's retirement: defeated on question of disestablishing Irish Church.
 Prince Michael of Servia assassinated: Milan became Prince.
 Treaty between Russia and Bokhara giving Samarkand to former.
 Isabella II dethroned in Spain.
 General Election in Britain: Liberal triumph: Gladstone's first ministry.
 President Johnson impeached in United States: Grant elected President.
 Hungarian autonomy.
 1869. SUEZ CANAL OPENED.
 Disestablishment and disendowment of Irish Church.
1870. Ollivier ministry in France.
 Bulgarian Exarchate established.
 Leopold of Hohenzollern accepted offer of Spanish crown: candidature soon withdrawn: France insisted on promise not to renew it.
 Bismarck modified the Ems telegram.
 France declared war (July 14): beginning of FRANCO-GERMAN WAR.
 Dogma of Papal Infallibility voted by Vatican Council: Ultramontane triumph.

- | | | | |
|-------|--|-------|---|
| 1870. | <i>Battle of Wörth:</i> Macmahon defeated by Crown Prince Frederick. | 1870. | Capitulation of Bazaine in Metz. |
| | <i>Battle of Spicheren:</i> French defeated. | | Russia denounced Black Sea clauses of Treaty of Paris. |
| | <i>Battle of Colombey:</i> German failure: battle drawn. | | Germans driven out of Orleans, but re-occupied it later. |
| | <i>Battle of Vionville:</i> drawn. | | Irish Land Act. |
| | <i>Battle of Gravelotte:</i> Bazaine defeated. | | Education Act for England and Wales. |
| | French troops finally abandoned Rome: Rome occupied by Italian troops and became capital of the kingdom. | | Prim assassinated in Madrid. |
| | <i>Battle of Sedan:</i> Capitulation of French army under Macmahon: the Emperor a prisoner. | | Amadeo I King of Spain. |
| | Republic proclaimed in France. | | Red River Rebellion in Canada under Louis Riel: suppressed by Wolseley. |
| | Revolution in Paris: Provisional government of National Defence. | | Nationalization of the telegraphs in Britain. |

THE LATEST AGE: A.D. 1871-1914

- | | | | |
|-------|---|-------|---|
| 1871. | GERMAN EMPIRE created at Versailles. | 1873. | The <i>Kulturkampf</i> in Germany. |
| | Conference of London modified Treaty of Paris of 1856. | | Macmahon President in France. |
| | Bombardment of Paris: capitulation. | | German troops evacuated France after indemnity had been paid. |
| | <i>Battle of Le Mans:</i> Germans defeated Chanzy. | | Death of Livingstone in Africa. |
| | Armistice between France and Germany. | 1874. | Disraeli Prime Minister after a General Election. |
| | Bourbaki's army disarmed in Switzerland. | | New Federal Constitution for Switzerland. |
| | National Assembly at Bordeaux: ratified peace and deposed Napoleon III. | | Treaty between Germany and Russia. |
| | Paris Commune set up: notable buildings destroyed, &c. | | Patronage Act repealed in Scotland. |
| | Treaty of Frankfort between France and Germany. | | Alfonso XII King of Spain. |
| | Treaty of Washington: <i>Alabama</i> claims submitted to arbitration. | 1875. | Insurrection in Herzegovina. |
| | Paris Commune suppressed with great cruelty. | | Britain annexed the Fiji Islands. |
| | Thiers became President of the French Republic. | | Russia obtained Sakhalin. |
| | Beginning of legislation legalizing trade unions in Britain. | | Treaty between Japan and Korea. |
| | | | Telephone invented by Bell. |
| 1872. | League of the Three Emperors. | 1876. | Disraeli bought Khedive's shares in Suez Canal for Britain. |
| | Oscar II King of Sweden and Norway. | | International control began in Egypt. |
| | Geneva award in <i>Alabama</i> case. | | Russia annexed Khokand. |
| | Education Act for Scotland. | | Bulgarian massacres. |
| | Ballot Act passed. | | Servia declared war against Turkey. |
| | Rebellion against Spain in the Philippines. | | Murad V became Sultan on deposition of Abdul Aziz: soon replaced by Abdul Hamid II. |
| | Self-government in Cape Colony. | | Hayes elected President of United States. |
| 1873. | Abdication of Amadeo in Spain: Republic proclaimed. | 1877. | Queen Victoria proclaimed Empress of India. |
| | Russia took Khiva. | | Russo-Turkish War began. |
| | | | Roumania declared independent. |
| | | | Siege and capture of Plevna. |

Conspectus of European History

	A.D.
1877. Britain annexed Transvaal. Satsuma rebellion in Japan. Porfirio Diaz became President of Mexico. Great Indian famine. Stanley explored the Congo.	1881. Revolt of the Mahdi in the Soudan. French protectorate on Upper Niger. 1882. Triple Alliance formed: Austria, Germany, and Italy. Servia declared itself a kingdom. War between Servia and Bulgaria. Phoenix Park murders in Dublin.
1878. Humbert I King of Italy. Russians took Adrianople; Montenegrins took Antivari, Dulcigno, &c. Leo XIII became Pope. Austria occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina. Treaty of San Stefano between Russia and Turkey. Treaty of Berlin replaced Treaty of San Stefano: Servia and Roumania independent; Bulgaria autonomous; Macedonia restored to Turkey. Cyprus placed under British administration. Second Afghan War began (ended in 1880).	Arabi Pasha Egyptian minister: national revolt against misgovernment. British fleet bombarded Alexandria. <i>Battle of Tel-el-Kebir</i> : Wolseley defeated Arabi Pasha. Death of Emerson. 1883. Destruction of Egyptian army under Hicks Pasha near El Obeid. French protectorate in Annam. Germany began national insurance. Death of Wagner.
1879. Zulu War. Prince Alexander first Prince of Bulgaria. Tewfik became Khedive of Egypt on deposition of Ismail. The dual control in Egypt: Britain and France. Alliance of Austria and Germany. Grévy President in France. Henry George's <i>Progress and Poverty</i> .	1884. Sir Evelyn Baring (Lord Cromer) Consul-general in Egypt. Three Emperors' League revived. Gordon in Khartum: besieged. Russia annexed Merv. Germany and Britain appropriated parts of New Guinea. French in Tonkin. Berlin Conference of the Powers regarding Africa. Convention of London between Britain and the Transvaal: Boer independence strengthened. THIRD REFORM ACT (followed by redistribution next year). Cleveland elected President of United States.
1880. Gladstone Prime Minister after a General Election. Britain recognized Abdurrahman as Amir of Afghanistan. Turkey ceded part of Thessaly to Greece. Montenegro obtained Dulcigno. Revolt of Boers in the Transvaal. Garfield elected President of United States.	1885. Fall of Khartum: Gordon killed: British and Egyptians evacuated the Soudan. Congo Free State constituted by the Powers. Russians and Afghans in conflict at Penjdeh. Salisbury Prime Minister. Treaty of Tientsin between France and China. Regency of Maria Christina in Spain. Italians occupied Massowah. Bulgaria absorbed Eastern Roumelia. Servia declared war against Bulgaria and suffered defeat. Second Rebellion in Canada under Louis Riel: Riel executed. Daimler invented his petrol engine.
1881. <i>Battle of Majuba Hill</i> : British defeated by Boers. Murder of Tsar Alexander II: Alexander III succeeded. France occupied Tunis. Transvaal independence recognized. Irish Land Act. Murder of President Garfield: Arthur became President of United States. Gambetta chief minister in France. Roumania declared itself a kingdom.	

A.D.

1886. Gladstone became Prime Minister.
 Alfonso XIII born to be King of Spain.
 Gladstone introduced his first HOME RULE BILL for Ireland: defeated in Commons.
 Salisbury Prime Minister.
 The Plan of Campaign in Ireland.
 Treaty of Bucharest settled Servo-Bulgarian War.
 Abdication of Prince Alexander in Bulgaria: Stambuloff the leading statesman.
 Britain annexed Upper Burma.
 Royal Niger Company formed.
 Canadian Pacific Railway completed.
 Gold discovered in the Transvaal.
1887. Jubilee of Queen Victoria.
 First Colonial Conference.
 Prince Ferdinand elected ruler of Bulgaria.
 Treaty between France and China.
 Carnot President in France.
1888. Frederick III German Emperor: soon succeeded by William II.
 British protectorate declared over parts of Borneo.
 Treaty between Russia and Korea.
 County Councils created in Britain.
 Parnell Commission.
 Harrison elected President of United States.
1889. Abdication of Milan in Servia: Alexander became King.
 Flight of General Boulanger: end of Boulangism in France.
 Franco-Russian entente.
 British South Africa Company formed.
 Pedro II deposed in Brazil: Brazil became a Republic.
 Carlos I King of Portugal.
 Treaty between Italy and Abyssinia.
 Death of Browning.
1890. Wilhelmina Queen of Holland.
 Fall of Bismarck.
 Britain ceded Heligoland to Germany.
 British protectorate over Zanzibar.
 French protectorate over Madagascar.
 First Japanese Parliament.
 Sherman Anti-Trust Act in United States.
1891. Trans-Siberian Railway begun.
1891. Agreement between Britain and Portugal regarding East Africa.
 Great famine in Russia.
 Abbas II became Khedive of Egypt.
 Panama scandals in France.
 France annexed the Ivory Coast.
 Indian Councils Act.
 Gladstone Prime Minister after a General Election.
 Cleveland again elected President of United States.
1893. Matabele War in Rhodesia.
 Natal granted responsible government.
 Gladstone's second Home Rule Bill rejected by the Lords.
 New Zealand adopted woman suffrage.
 Behring Sea arbitration between Britain and the United States.
1894. Nicholas II became Tsar.
 Gladstone resigned: Rosebery became Prime Minister.
 Murder of President Carnot in France: Casimir-Périer elected successor.
 Trial and condemnation of Dreyfus in France.
 Armenian massacres.
 War between Japan and China: latter easily defeated.
 Return of King Milan in Servia.
 British protectorate over Uganda.
 Harcourt's great Budget.
 Motor vehicles became common.
1895. Franco-Russian alliance.
 Salisbury Prime Minister: Conservative victory at General Election.
 Jameson Raid.
 Faure President in France.
 Murder of Stambuloff in Bulgaria.
 British ultimatum to the Transvaal.
 Armenian massacres.
 The X-rays discovered by Röntgen.
1896. Franco-British treaty regarding Siam.
 France annexed Madagascar.
 Insurrection in Crete: international intervention.
Battle of Adowa: Italians heavily defeated in Abyssinia.
 Outbreak of plague in India.
 McKinley elected President of United States.
 Marconi perfected wireless telegraphy.

Conspectus of European History

A.D.

1897. Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee.
 Massacre in Crete: international occupation.
 War between Greece and Turkey: Turkey easily victorious.
 Autonomy proclaimed for Crete.
 Revolt of tribes on Indian north-west frontier.
 Germany seized Kiao-chow in China.
 Philippine revolt against Spain.
1898. United States declared war against Spain.
 Egyptian army under Kitchener took Omdurman and reconquered the Sudan.
 The French under Marchand at Fashoda.
 Dargai stormed: Indian frontier rebellion ended.
 Treaty of Paris between Spain and United States: Spain lost all her American possessions and also the Philippines.
 Russia obtained Port Arthur from China.
 Britain obtained Wei-hai-wei from China.
 United States annexed Hawaii.
 Prince George of Greece High Commissioner in Crete.
 Irish Local Government Act.
 Radium discovered.
1899. Loubet President in France.
 FIRST PEACE CONFERENCE AT THE HAGUE.
 End of Dreyfus affair in France.
 Outbreak of South African War.
 Ladysmith, Mafeking, and Kimberley besieged by Boers.
 Germany and the United States annexed and shared Samoa Islands.
 Venezuela boundary question settled.
 Gold discovered in Klondyke.
 The Khalifa defeated and killed in the Sudan.
Battle of Modder River: Boers defeated by Lord Methuen.
Battle of Stormberg: Boers defeated Gatacre.
Battle of Magersfontein: Boers defeated Methuen.
Battle of the Tugela: Boers defeated Buller.
 United Irish League formed.
 Value of rupee fixed on a gold basis in India.
- A.D.
1900. *Battle of Spion Kop:* Boers defeated Buller.
 Kimberley relieved.
Battle of Paardeberg: Boers under Cronje surrendered to Lord Roberts.
 Relief of Ladysmith and Mafeking.
 Annexation of Orange Free State and Transvaal.
 United Free Church of Scotland founded by union of Free and United Presbyterian Churches.
 Royal Niger Company's territories taken over by the Crown.
 British protectorate over Lagos and Nigeria.
 Boxer attack on Pekin legations.
 Victor Emmanuel III King of Italy after murder of Humbert I.
 Pekin taken by international force.
 Unionist victory at General Election.
 King Alexander's *coup d'état* in Serbia.
1901. Commonwealth of Australia founded.
 Edward VII King of England (Edward I of Scotland).
 Philippine revolt suppressed by the United States.
 Taff Vale decision of Lords affecting legal position of trade unions.
 Assassination of President McKinley: Roosevelt became President.
 Trans-Siberian Railway opened.
 Treaty between France and Morocco.
1902. Anglo-Japanese Alliance.
 Treaty between China and Russia.
 Peace of Vereeniging ended Boer War.
 Resignation of Salisbury: Balfour Prime Minister.
 Education Act for England and Wales: keen opposition by Nonconformists.
1903. Sugar Convention abolished sugar bounties.
 Pius X became Pope.
 Alexander King of Serbia murdered: Peter I became King.
 Anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia.
 Chamberlain resigned in order to advocate Protection.
 Irish Land Purchase Act.
 United States recognized Panama as independent republic and leased the Canal district.
 Macedonian unrest: Mürzsteg programme of the Powers.

- | A.D. | A.D. |
|--|--|
| 1903. Death of Herbert Spencer. | 1907. Second Hague Conference. |
| 1904. War between Russia and Japan. | Death of Lord Kelvin. |
| Chinese labour introduced into the Transvaal. | Gustavus V King of Sweden. |
| Anglo-French agreement and <i>entente</i> . | 1908. Carlos I of Portugal murdered; Manuel became King. |
| <i>Battle of the Yalu</i> : Japanese victory. | Asquith Prime Minister. |
| <i>Battle of Nanshan</i> : Japanese victory. | Old Age Pensions introduced in Britain. |
| <i>Battle of Liao-yang</i> : Japanese victory. | Young Turk revolution in Constantinople. |
| <i>Battle of Sha-ho</i> : Japanese victory. | Bulgaria declared herself an independent kingdom. |
| Dogger Bank incident between Britain and Russia: settled peaceably. | Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. |
| End of the Concordat between France and the Pope. | Destructive earthquake in southern Italy and Sicily. |
| British expedition to Tibet. | Belgium annexed the Congo State. |
| Licensing Act for England and Wales. | 1909. Albert I King of Belgium. |
| Revolt in German South-West Africa. | Deposition of Abdul Hamid II: Mohammed V Sultan. |
| Death of Watts, the famous painter. | Radical Budget introduced by Lloyd George: rejected by the Lords. |
| 1905. Japanese captured Port Arthur. | Osborne Judgment preventing use of trade union funds for political action. |
| <i>Battle of Mukden</i> : Japanese victory. | Union of South Africa formed. |
| <i>Battle of Tsushima</i> : Russian fleet destroyed. | North Pole reached by Peary. |
| Japanese captured Sakhalin. | Indian Councils Act. |
| Treaty of Portsmouth settled Russo-Japanese War. | Trade Boards Act to deal with sweated labour. |
| Norway separated from Sweden: Haakon VII became King of Norway. | Blériot crossed the English Channel in an aeroplane: rapid development of aviation. |
| Russian revolution: Tsar promised reforms. | Taft elected President of United States. |
| Church and State separated in France. | 1910. General Election (Jan.): Liberal victory. |
| Campbell-Bannerman became Prime Minister. | Labour Exchanges established in Britain. |
| 1906. General Election in Britain: overwhelming Liberal victory. | End of Chinese labour on Transvaal goldfields. |
| Algeciras Conference on Morocco. | Lloyd George's Budget passed. |
| Self-government granted to Transvaal. | George V King of Britain. |
| Fallières President in France. | Constitutional Conference between Government and Opposition regarding Lords' Veto: failed. |
| Frederick VIII King of Denmark. | Japan annexed Korea. |
| Dictatorship of Franco in Portugal. | Montenegro declared itself a kingdom. |
| First Russian Duma met. | Monarchy overthrown in Portugal: republic proclaimed. |
| Trade Disputes Act reversed Taff Vale decision. | Death of Tolstoi. |
| Revival of woman suffrage movement in Britain. | General Election (December): Liberal victory. |
| Death of Ibsen. | PARLIAMENT ACT passed after King George had agreed to creation of peers on advice of Prime Minister: absolute veto of Lords ended. |
| 1907. Anglo-Russian Convention regarding Persia and other questions. | 66 |
| Self-government granted to Orange River Colony. | |
| Territorial and Reserve Forces Act. | |
| Small Holdings and Allotments Act for England and Wales. | |
| VOL. IV. | |

Conspectus of European History

- A.D.
- Payment of members introduced in Britain.
 - Great labour unrest, culminating in a national railway strike in Britain.
 - Assassination of Stolypin, the Russian Premier.
 - German intervention in Morocco: Europe on brink of war.
 - Italy declared war against Turkey on the Tripoli question: Tripoli annexed by Italy.
 - Chinese revolution: Manchu dynasty overthrown and republic set up.
 - National Insurance Act passed.
 - South Pole reached by Amundsen.
 - 1912.** National strike of coal miners in Britain: settled by passage of Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act.
 - The *Titanic* sunk in the Atlantic.
 - Third Home Rule for Ireland Bill introduced: passed through Commons, but rejected by Lords.
 - Christian X King of Denmark.
 - Welsh Disestablishment Bill introduced: passed through Commons, but rejected by Lords.
 - Yoshihito became Emperor of Japan.
 - Death of General Booth, founder of Salvation Army.
 - Peace of Ouchy between Italy and Turkey: Italy acquired Tripoli.
 - War between Turkey and the Balkan States.
 - Assassination of Canalejas, Premier of Spain.
 - Battle of Kirk Kilisse*: Bulgarians defeated Turks.
 - Battle of Lule Burgas*: Bulgarians defeated Turks.
 - Battle of Kumanovo*: Servians defeated Turks.
 - Greeks took Salonica.
 - Battle of Monastir*: Servians defeated Turks.
 - Armistice of Chatalja in Balkan War.
 - Balkan Peace Conference in London: unsuccessful: war renewed.
 - Treaty between France and Morocco: virtual French protectorate.
 - 1913.** Poincaré elected President of French Republic.
 - Huerta proclaimed himself President in Mexico and murdered Madero.
 - Woodrow Wilson became President of United States.
 - 1913. Bulgarians took Adrianople. Greeks took Janina.
 - King George of Greece murdered: Constantine I succeeded.
 - Montenegrins took Scutari.
 - Servia and Greece fought against Bulgaria: Roumania declared war against Bulgaria.
 - Bulgaria defeated: Turks recaptured Adrianople.
 - Treaty of Bucharest settled Balkan wars: increases of territory to Servia, Greece, Montenegro, Bulgaria, and Roumania; Turkey lost Macedonia, part of Thrace, Albania, and most of the islands; Albanian kingdom founded.
 - Trade Unions Act empowered trade unions to raise political fund, safeguarding rights of minorities.
 - Last renewal of Triple Alliance.
 - Panama Canal practically completed.
 - 1914.** United States at war with Mexico: United States troops occupied Vera Cruz: Huerta eventually resigned.
 - Great Strike in South Africa: Botha deported labour leaders to Britain.
 - Murder of Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to Austrian throne, in Serajevo, capital of Bosnia.
 - Austria declared war against Servia: Russia mobilized against Austria: Germany declared war against Russia and invaded France and Belgium.
 - Britain declared war against Germany in support of France and Belgium.
 - Lord Kitchener became British Secretary for War: British Expeditionary Force landed in France under Sir John French: British navy supreme at sea under Sir John Jellicoe.
 - Japan declared war on Germany.
 - Belgium overrun by Germans, and Brussels occupied: Louvain sacked: German invasion of France resisted by retreating strategy of Franco-British forces under Joffre and French, followed by victorious offensive (*Battle of the Marne*).
 - Russian invasion of Germany and Austria: Austria heavily defeated by both Servia and Russia.
 - German colonies occupied by British colonial troops.
 - Benedict XV elected Pope.
 - Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment Acts passed, but operation suspended till end of war.

THE GREAT MOVEMENTS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY

MODERN HISTORY (*Cont.*)

FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE NEW WORLD TO THE PRESENT DAY

E. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE AGE OF NAPOLEON (1789-1815)

I. The French Revolution.—A movement of many aspects, one of which was the democratic aspect, in which it forms a phase in the gradual movement towards revolt against monarchical tyranny, a movement commencing in England, and spreading to North America, France, Germany, and most of the other European countries. Chief phases of movement were English Révolution of 1689, American Revolution (establishment of independence) of 1775 to 1783, French Revolution of 1789, and European Revolutions of 1830 and 1848. Hand in hand with this movement went that towards nationality, the desire to make states coincide with nations, although in some cases a militant democracy thirsted after an empire (cf. the French democracy after the Revolution).

(1) CAUSES.—Each cause indicates an aspect of the movement.

(a) *Financial*.—National bankruptcy after a century of war (1689-1789). Centralized system established under Richelieu, Mazarin, and Louis XIV, and continued under Louis XV (1715-1774) and Louis XVI (1774-1793), unable to restore financial stability; efforts of Turgot (a follower of Quesnay, the founder of the Physiocratic school of Political Economy) and Necker unavailing.

(b) *Social*.—Rule of "privilege". France divided into social classes almost as exclusive as the classes under the caste system in India. Three orders—nobility, clergy, and commons. Last-named had to bear the burden of taxation, while first two orders held all state privileges. Feudal abuses remained; Church and Army the privilege of the noble orders.

(c) *Political*.—Feeling of resentment against monarchy as the cause of the financial chaos and the social exclusiveness; no central popular institution in France (States-General had not met since 1614). Influence of men like Lafayette, who were imbued with the popular doctrines of the American Revolution.

(d) *Intellectual*.—A kind of Renaissance of thought. Awakening of France due to Voltaire (poet, dramatist, historian, and satirist), who appealed to the educated classes; to Rousseau (apostle of the multitude; appealed to reasons of men in *Contrat Social*, just as Locke and Hobbes had appealed during the English Revolution); and to Diderot and D'Alembert, the Encyclopædistes, who issued in 1771 a new encyclopædia.

The discontent of France found expression in the States-General, summoned in 1789 (after an interval of 175 years) to consider the financial chaos. Events of Revolution can only be summarized in outline here.

(2) DESTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION.—*Ancien régime*—monarchy and privilege—destroyed; new constitutions set up. A period of experiment (cf. Commonwealth period in England), indicating the persistence of old institutions

Great Movements of European History

such as the monarchy, and the difficulty of constructive work in politics. Events of Revolution best summarized in periods corresponding to the ruling bodies of France:—

(a) *The National Assembly* (1789-1791).—

- (a) Commons declared themselves, with or without other two estates, the National Assembly—"the precise moment from which the Revolution, as a Revolution, begins to act". Contest henceforward between legality and illegality. Abolition of privilege.
- (b) *Leaders of National Assembly*.—Danton, Lafayette, Mirabeau ("the chief of the 'practical' men of the Revolution"), and Robespierre ("the idol of the populace").
- (c) *Influence of Mob*.—Storming of Bastille; insurrections in Paris; King conducted to Tuilleries. "Lafayette was henceforth the prisoner of the mob."
- (d) *Formation of Clubs*, chief of which was that of Jacobins. Influence of extreme ideas of Robespierre became paramount.
- (e) *Attempted Flight of the King*, caused by the drawing up of the new constitution.
- (f) *New Constitution*.—Legislative Assembly to be summoned, and to be superior to executive. Death of Mirabeau, broken down by disappointment at the non-success of his plans to preserve some measure of authority to the King under the new constitution.
- (b) *Legislative Assembly* (1791-1792).—Composed of men without experience in the art of governing, since no member of the National Assembly was eligible for election.
- (a) *Republican Ideas*.—Supremacy of the "Gironde" ("the Plain," the moderate republicans) and the "Mountain" (the extremists, desirous to continue the Revolution). Only the "Feuillants" supported the constitution.
- (b) *War declared against Austria* (1792).—Commencement of conflict between Europe and the Revolution (see *infra*).
- (c) Tuilleries stormed by the mob. Influence over mob of extremists such as Robespierre, Danton, and Marat. Suspension of monarchy voted, and election of a National Convention decreed. September massacres, to cow the monarchists.
- (c) *The National Convention* (1792-1795).—Composed entirely of republicans. Abolition of monarchy followed by execution of King (1793). First Coalition (1793) formed

against France; Committee of Public Safety appointed. Supremacy of the "Mountain", the mob demanding the arrest of the Girondist leaders. Latter excluded from Convention.

(a) *The Reign of Terror* (1793-1794).—

Gradual supremacy of the party of Robespierre with the "Mountain" over those of Marat and Danton (murder of Marat, 1793). Law of the Suspects—prisons filled with persons suspected of any sympathy with moderate ideas. Revolutionary Tribunal set up to empty the prisons—Marie Antoinette executed. New calendar introduced. "Feast of Reason" held in Notre Dame, followed by execution of party of Marat and Danton. Robespierre now supreme. "Festival of the Supreme Being" held, to counteract influence of "Feast of Reason". Terror established on a larger scale than before. Fall and execution of Robespierre (1794) as a result of Thermidorian reaction.

(b) *Rule of the Thermidorians* (1794-1795).—National Convention now controlled by Moderates. Abolition of terror and completion of a new constitution. Insurrection in Paris of lawless elements suppressed by Napoleon Bonaparte, who was entrusted with the work by Barras.

(d) *The Directory* (1795-1799).—Executive functions entrusted to council of five (the Directory); legislative functions to two chambers—Council of Five Hundred and Council of the Ancients. Conduct of war against Austria entrusted to Napoleon Bonaparte (1797—see *infra*). Egyptian expedition of Bonaparte (1798-1799) followed by his return home and his overthrow of the Directory. Henceforth, European history centres round him. Two more periods:—

(e) *The Consulate* (1799-1804).—See *infra*.

(f) *The Empire* (1804-1815).—See *infra*.

II. The War with Europe (1793-1815).—Chief phases:—

- (1) **WAR OF THE FIRST COALITION** (1793-1797).
- (2) **THE NILE AND THE SECOND COALITION** (1799-1802).
- (3) **WAR OF THE THIRD COALITION** (1805-1807).—Commencement of the struggle with Napoleon.
- (4) **THE COMMERCIAL WAR** (1806-1807).
- (5) **THE PENINSULAR WAR** (1808-1814).
- (6) **WAR WITH UNITED STATES** (1812-1815).—For account of this, see summary of history of United States.

(7) THE LAST PHASE.—Russian, Prussian, and French campaigns (1812-1814), the escape from Elba, the Congress of Vienna, and the Hundred Days

Only the merest outlines of this great struggle can be indicated here.

III. War of the First Coalition (1793-1797).—The Revolution had become militant.

(1) CAUSES.

- (a) French proclamation of November, 1792, offering French assistance to all peoples who would rebel against their governments.
- (b) French annexation of Austrian Netherlands.
- (c) Execution of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette.

(2) MEMBERS OF COALITION.—Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, Holland, and Spain. Policy of Pitt the Younger (in office 1783 to 1806, with only a short interval), to subsidize our allies and to use the British navy to defend our coasts from attack (cf. policy of Pitt the Elder in Seven Years' War).

(3) EVENTS.

- (a) *Rise of Bonaparte* during this war. Family of Italian origin, settled in Corsica since early sixteenth century. Father of Napoleon, Charles Bonaparte, a follower of Paoli in the quest for Corsican independence from Genoa and then France. Napoleon sent to France to become a soldier. In France during Revolution. Witnessed storming of Tuilleries. Distinguished conduct at Toulon, which had deserted Revolution. Promotion, through influence of Barras, to position of second in command of army of interior, and then to command of Italian army.
- (b) *Events on Land*.—Non-success of allies. Coalition broken up by secession of Holland (reorganized as Batavian Republic), Prussia, Spain, and Austria. (Treaty of Campo Formio, 1797, after brilliant campaign of Bonaparte in Italy.) Great Britain left alone.
- (c) *Events on Sea*.—British victories off Brest ("Glorious First of June", 1794), Cape St. Vincent (1797), and Camperdown (1797).

IV. The Nile and the Second Coalition (1799-1802).

(1) EXPEDITION OF BONAPARTE TO THE EAST.—Aim to occupy Malta and Egypt, and to threaten India.

Malta occupied. Battle of the Nile

(Aboukir Bay)—victory of Nelson; Bonaparte cut off from France. Battle of the Pyramids (1798). Capture of Jaffa and unsuccessful siege of Acre (defended by Sir Sidney Smith—"that man made me miss my destiny", said Bonaparte). Return of Bonaparte to France, overthrow of Directory, and establishment of Consulate (Bonaparte First Consul).

(2) WAR OF THE SECOND COALITION.

(a) *Members of Coalition*.—Great Britain, Austria, and Russia.

(b) *Events*.—Coalition broken up by defeat of (a) Austria at Marengo and Hohenlinden (1800)—Peace of Lunéville; and (b) Russia at Zürich. Great Britain again left alone.

(c) *Armed Neutrality* (first formed 1780 and now revived) of Russia, Denmark, and Sweden, due to British claim to right of search during war. Nelson and Hyde Parker sent to Baltic—bombardment of Copenhagen (1801); murder of Czar Paul and accession of Alexander I (1801). Armed neutrality broken up.

(3) TREATY OF AMIENS (1802).

- (a) French Republic recognized by Great Britain.
- (b) Great Britain kept Trinidad and Ceylon.
- (c) Malta restored to Knights of St. John, under Russian protection.

V. War of the Third Coalition (1805-1807).—Treaty of Amiens only a truce.

(1) NAPOLEON EMPEROR (1804).—Reconstruction of France during period of peace. Government centralized; Church and State reconciled by Concordat of 1801; compilation of *Code Napoléon*, greatest legal work since time of Justinian. Imperial coronation at Notre Dame (1804) attended by Pope.

(2) NAPOLEON AND THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE.

(a) *Extinction of Electorates of Cologne and Trèves (Trier)* by Napoleon (1803).—Title of Elector conferred on four other German princes.

(b) *Charles the Great and Napoleon*.—Latter regarded in 1804 as successor of Charles. Parallel believed in by Napoleon himself, who loved to indulge in the forms of the revived Roman Empire of Charlemagne, including the papal presence (*Pius VII*) at his coronation and the coronation of his son as "King of the Romans". But beyond this "sort of grand historical similarity between their positions" (Bryce: *Holy Roman Empire*), and the aspiration of Napoleon to be Emperor of the West,

there is no likeness between the Frankish king and the French emperor.

(c) *End of Holy Roman Empire* (1806).—Gradual absorption into France, since Treaty of Campo Formio, of territories of German princes. Act of Confederation of the Rhine (1806)—Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and other Rhine states withdrew from the Empire and placed themselves under French protection. Abdication of Francis II as Holy Roman Emperor, and assumption of title of "Emperor of Austria". *End of Holy Roman Empire.*】

(3) MEMBERS OF COALITION.—Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia.

(4) EVENTS.—Invasion of England planned, but frustrated at Trafalgar (1805). Coalition broken up by surrender of Austrians at Ulm, and defeats of Austerlitz (Russia and Austria), Jena and Auerstadt (Prussia), Eylau and Friedland (Russia). Vienna and Berlin occupied; Russia came to terms at Tilsit; meeting of Napoleon, Alexander I, and Frederick William of Prussia. Alliance between Napoleon and Alexander, object being for them to divide Europe between them. Meantime, in England, deaths of Pitt and Fox (1806). Great Britain again left alone.

VI. The Commercial War (1806-1807).—Evolution of "Continental System", aimed at commerce of Great Britain, since the French army and the British fleet could not fight each other.

(1) *BERLIN DECREES* (November, 1806).—British Isles declared by Napoleon to be in a state of blockade.

(2) *ORDERS IN COUNCIL* (January to November, 1807).—Reply of Great Britain to Berlin Decrees. No trade to be carried on between Great Britain and French ports or ports occupied by French troops.

(3) *MILAN DECREES* (December, 1807).—Any ship of any country which had touched at a British port liable to seizure. This threat was of no avail, as France had no effective fleet.

The decrees mark the point at which Napoleon overreached himself. From now we have to trace the successive steps in his fall as marked by the campaigns in the Peninsula, Russia, Prussia, and Belgium.

In the meantime the war continued—

Cape Colony taken from Dutch (1805-1806), Heligoland seized from Denmark (1807), and Mauritius captured from the French (1810).

VII. The Peninsular War (1808-1814).—First national rising against Napoleon.

(1) CAUSES.

(a) Attempt to force Continental System on Portugal, which still admitted British goods.

(b) Intervention of Napoleon in Spain—occasion was quarrel between Charles IV and his son Ferdinand. Spain given to Napoleon's brother, Joseph, and Naples to Murat.

(2) EVENTS.—Help sent to Portugal by Great Britain.

(a) *Establishment of British in Portugal.*—Carried out under Wellesley, and complete by 1809. Napoleon in Spain—Moore pursued to Corunna (1809).

(b) *British Defence of Portugal.*—Talavera—victory of Wellesley, who was made Viscount Wellington. Lines of Torres Vedras—turning-point of war.

(c) *Invasion of Spain.*—French driven out of Peninsula. Chief fortresses captured by Wellington, who was victorious at Albuera, Salamanca, Vittoria, and Toulouse.

VIII. The Last Phase (1812-1815).—Northern and central nations of Europe began to follow example of Portugal. Attempt of Austria to rouse national spirit of Germany defeated at Wagram (1809)—marriage of Napoleon with Marie Louise of Austria; secession of Russia from French alliance; signs of Prussian revival under Stein, who was dismissed at Napoleon's instigation (1808). Napoleon incensed chiefly against Russia. Decision of Austria and Prussia to throw in their lot with Russia, which was supported also by Sweden (under Bernadotte, a former French marshal, adopted heir of Charles XIII of Sweden).

(1) *RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN (1812).*—Battle of Borodino (7th September), followed by French march on Moscow; burning of Moscow (began 15th September) and disastrous French retreat; 200,000 men perished in the campaign, and almost as many more were left prisoners.

(2) *PRUSSIAN CAMPAIGN (1813).*—The

"War of Liberation". Long hesitation on the part of Frederick William to throw in his lot against Napoleon. Chief Prussian general was Blücher. Final defeat of Napoleon at Leipzig ("The Battle of the Nations", 18th October). Same year (1813) saw overthrow of French domination in Spain at Vittoria.

(3) INVASION OF FRANCE (1814).—The most brilliant of Napoleon's campaigns. But the odds were against him, and the allies entered Paris. Abdication of Napoleon (11th April)—title of emperor to be retained; Elba allotted as his residence; income to be 2,000,000 francs. Congress summoned to meet at Vienna.

(4) CONGRESS OF VIENNA.—The greatest European congress since the Council of Constance.

(a) *Chief Representatives.*—Castlereagh (England), Talleyrand (France), Metternich (Austria), Frederick William of Prussia, and Alexander I of Russia.

(b) *Principles.*—Conservatism and legitimacy—reaction after revolution.

(c) *Chief Arrangements.*—Crucial questions were respective fates of Saxony and Poland.

(a) *Russia* obtained grand-duchy of Warsaw, and granted to the Poles a constitution.

(b) *Prussia* obtained part of Saxony and other territorial gains.

(y) *Confederation of German states* formed under leadership of Austria—a confederation as much lacking in unity as the Holy Roman Empire.

(d) *Austria* lost the Netherlands, but was compensated with Venice and Lombardy.

(e) *Savoy* (under Victor Emmanuel I; see *infra* in account of Unification of Italy) recovered Sardinia and was granted Genoa.

(f) *Naples* left in the hands of Murat, who had been made King of Naples by Napoleon. He was soon expelled, and was succeeded by a Bourbon.

(g) *Switzerland* declared independent and neutral.

(h) *Netherlands*.—Kingdom formed by union of Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg under House of Orange. Strong barrier against French aggression towards the Rhine.

(i) *Great Britain* confirmed in possession of Malta and the Cape of Good Hope.

(5) THE "HUNDRED DAYS" (March to June, 1815). Escape of Napoleon

broke up deliberations of Congress. Battles of Ligny, Quatre Bras, and Waterloo decided campaign of 1815.

(6) SECOND PEACE OF PARIS (20th November, 1815).

(a) France to pay an indemnity of 700,000,000 francs, and to maintain in the north an army of the allies for five years.

(b) Frontier of France to be practically as settled at the Congress of Vienna.

(c) Bourbon dynasty again restored in the person of Louis XVIII.

The eighteenth century, like the seventeenth, thus ends with a great European congress following a great war. Prussia has advanced a step towards the leadership of Germany, being now the bulwark against French aggression. Austria still has dominions in Italy, and Italian nationality is soon to find its expression in the rise of the House of Savoy. The Netherlands are united, but the union does not possess the elements of stability. Problems are thus left unsolved; but the work of the Congress of Vienna lies in ending a struggle lasting for almost a quarter of a century, and thus directing attention towards the internal affairs of the countries which had shared in it. The nineteenth century now opens and unfolds to us the story of the attainment of national ideals and of democratic forms of government.

F. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

PROGRESS TOWARDS NATIONALISM AND DEMOCRACY

I. Nations and States.—Boundaries not identical. E.g., Great Britain and Austria-Hungary each contain more than one nation; and the Poles and the Jews are divided amongst several states. The movement that began in the early nineteenth century, by which Belgium and Italy became independent national communities, is still proceeding. Where nations and states do not coincide, the tendency is either that they should become independent of one another (cf. Norway and Sweden), or that the separate nationalities should obtain governments of their own theoretically subordinate

to some central body (cf. the Home Rule movement in Ireland and the establishment of the self-governing communities of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa). In a word, the formula of the nineteenth century and that of the twentieth century may be found in the desire of national feeling for its expression in a political body.

II. Democracy.—The growth of industrial communities and the rush towards the towns has resulted in social problems which the monarchies and aristocracies of the eighteenth century could never have solved. Hence there has arisen a conviction that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, by means of representative institutions, is the only form of government that can solve those social problems.

The nineteenth century is therefore concerned with these two broad aspects of the growth of the nations. It remains for us now to consider their main features.

III. The Holy Alliance.—Formed 26th September, 1815, comprising Russia, Austria, and Prussia.

(1) AIMS.

- (a) Repression of revolutionary movements in Europe; this was the real aim.
- (b) Regulation of state affairs, both internal and external, in accordance with the principles of Christianity; this was the ostensible aim.

(2) ATTITUDE OF GREAT BRITAIN.—

All powers were invited to join the alliance, except the Pope and the Sultan of Turkey. Great Britain refused to become a party to it; Wellington suggested that it was "not sufficiently definite". Yet Castlereagh (Foreign Secretary in the Liverpool ministry from 1812 till his suicide in 1822) sympathized with the aims of the Alliance, and the repressive policy of the Liverpool ministry (1812–1827) accorded with its principles.

IV. The Revolutions in Spain and Naples (1820–1829).

(1) SPAIN.—Under Ferdinand VII (a Bourbon prince), who refused to carry out his promise of a new consti-

tution. Florida sold to United States (1819) to raise money. Revolt in Spain spread to colonies (see *supra*), which gained their independence. Occupation of Spain by French troops to restore order (1823–1827). Independence of Spanish colonies recognized by Canning as a protest against French occupation.

(2) NAPLES.—Restoration of absolute government after 1815 in Piedmont, Lombardy, and Venice. Formation of secret societies (e.g. *Carbonari*) in Italy. First outbreak in Naples; Ferdinand I promised to observe the constitution. Outbreaks also in Piedmont. Serious alarm of Austria, which feared for the loss of her power in Italy. Hence,

(3) CONGRESS OF TROPPAU (1820).—Influence of Metternich. Powers agreed to call Ferdinand I to Laybach, where it was decided that an Austrian army should enter Naples and restore Ferdinand's authority. Sicily and Naples reduced.

(4) CONGRESS OF VERONA (1822).—Called owing to continuance of disorders in Spain and Greek revolt. Decision that French army should occupy Spain (see *supra*). Wellington (British envoy) protested against this decision.

V. The Revolutions of 1830.—A movement commencing in France.

(1) FRANCE.—Restored Bourbons had "learned nothing and forgotten nothing".

(a) *Louis XVIII* (1815–1824).—Granted a constitution and two chambers, but still retained the old monarchical prejudices.

(b) *Charles X* (1824–1830).—Attempted to restore absolutism. "July Ordinances" aimed at limiting number of voters. Riots, ending in deposition of Charles and accession of Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, who was reputed to be a man of liberal principles.

(2) BELGIUM.—Hatred of Dutch union, which was work of Congress of Vienna. Greater freedom and a separate administration demanded. Independence (under Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, Leopold I, 1831–1865) granted at Congress of Brussels, following Conference of London (1830).

(3) GERMANY AND ITALY.—In Ger-

many, Austria and Prussia still held to absolute ideas; only in the smaller states did the people obtain concessions. In Italy the only result of the 1830 movement was increased hatred of Austrian control.

(4) POLAND.—Risings against Russia. Policy of Nicholas I was severe and unpopular. Provisional government set up by Poles, but complete defeat of rebels by Russians. Organic Statute of 1832 deprived Poland of her constitution, and introduced repressive measures (80,000 Poles sent to Siberia in 1832).

VI. The Revolutions of 1848.—France again the leader of revolutionary Europe.

(1) FRANCE.

(a) *Louis Philippe* (1830-1848).—The *roi bourgeois*—the king only of a party. Three parties—the Bonapartists, the Bourbons, and the Republicans—did not support him. Conflict of labour and capital just then commencing in France. In his support of the middle class Louis Philippe forgot the lower classes.

(b) *The Franchise Question*.—Chief ministers, Guizot and Thiers, opposed on this question. Only 209,000 voters out of population of 30,000,000. "Reform Banquet" arranged for 22nd February, 1848, prevented by police. Riots in Paris; flight of Louis Philippe to England.

(c) *Louis Napoleon* elected President of a new republic—an unwise choice, for he was nephew of Napoleon I, and heir to the Napoleonic traditions.

(2) GERMANY.

(a) *Constitutional governments* established at Vienna and Berlin.

(b) *National unity* desired.

(a) Question arising as to whether Prussia or Austria should become the centre of a German nation. Plan completed, but Frederick William IV of Prussia refused the crown. Result was reinstatement of "Bund" of 1815.

(b) Question of Schleswig-Holstein; personal union with Denmark. People desired union with Germany. Rising of 1848 against Danes. Convention of Malmö decided that Schleswig-Holstein should remain Danish.

(3) ITALY.

(a) Milan and Venice declared their independence; joined by Tuscany, Rome, and Sicily. Leader was Charles Albert, King of Sardinia. Rebels defeated by Austrians

at Custoza (1848). Abdication of Charles Albert and accession of his son, Victor Emmanuel II. Reconquest of Lombardy and Venice by Austria, but lesson of Italian unity under house of Savoy had been learnt.

(b) ROME.—Constitution obtained from Pope Pius IX, who refused to join in war against Austria. Calamity of Pope's double position shown. Flight of Pius IX (November, 1848) and declaration of Roman republic under Mazzini. Intervention of Louis Napoleon, defeat of Garibaldi, and restoration of papal rule.

(4) AUSTRIA.—Many races in Empire. Revolutions at Prague, Budapest, and Vienna, besides Italian troubles. Home Rule, and then independence, demanded by Hungarians under Louis Kossuth. Accession of Emperor Francis Joseph (1848). Questions of rivalry with Prussia now had to be faced.

VII. Unification of Italy (1848-1866).—Chief obstacles were jealousy of Venice, Papal objections to loss of temporal power, and Austrian occupation.

(1) WAR WITH AUSTRIA.—Victor Emmanuel advised by Cavour to ally with France against Austria. At Magenta and Solferino (1859) Austrians were defeated by French and Italians. Truce of Villa Franca (1859). Lombardy ceded to Sardinia; Nice and Savoy became French.

(2) ALLIANCE OF VICTOR EMMANUEL WITH GARIBALDI.—Conquest of Sicily and Naples by Garibaldi. Only Venice and Rome left. Victor Emmanuel declared King of Italy (1861)—first Parliament met at Turin.

(3) WAR OF 1866 BETWEEN PRUSSIA AND AUSTRIA.—Alliance between Italy and Prussia. Italian defeats at Custoza and off Lissa (in Adriatic) compensated for by Prussian victory of Sadowa. Peace of Prague (1866)—Venice ceded to Italy.

(4) FRANCO-GERMAN WAR (1870-1871).—French troops had to be withdrawn from Rome. Seizure of Rome by Victor Emmanuel. Pope left in possession of Vatican. Rome became capital of Italy. Completion of Italian unity.

VIII. Unification of Germany.

—Could not be accomplished without force. But Bismarck (minister of William I, King of Prussia, 1861–1888) was equal to his task.

(1) **QUESTION OF SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.**—Schleswig incorporated by Denmark on accession of Christian IX (1863). Repudiation of Danish connection by the two duchies. Invasion of Schleswig-Holstein by Austria and Prussia in alliance; duchies ceded to the two powers at Vienna. Dispute over question of share of each in the spoils.

(2) **WAR BETWEEN AUSTRIA AND PRUSSIA.**—Greater question of leadership of Germany to be settled—culmination of rivalry of Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa. Prussian victory of Sadowa (see *supra*)—Austria at feet of Prussia, which obtained Schleswig-Holstein. Henceforth, Austria cut off from north. Dual empire of Austria and Hungary proclaimed (1867).

(3) **NORTH-GERMAN CONFEDERATION** of Protestant states formed by Bismarck. Four feeble detached states refused to join — Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and Hesse.

(4) **FRANCO-GERMAN WAR (1870-1871).**

(a) *Decline of Napoleon III.*—Intervention in Mexico (violation of Monroe Doctrine) and Spain (crown of Spain offered to Leopold of Hohenzollern, who withdrew owing to French opposition). Refusal of William I of Prussia to give a guarantee that Leopold would not again become a candidate for the Spanish crown. Napoleon declared war, hoping for support of the four South German states.)

(b) *Germany united* by action of these states in joining the Confederation.

(c) *Events of War.*—French disasters at Wörth, Gravelotte (French shut in Metz by Moltke), and Sedan. Fall of Paris (28th January, 1871).

(5) **SETTLEMENT OF FRANCE AND GERMANY.**

(a) *France.*—Flight of Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie to England (death of former at Chiselhurst, 1873). Third Republic set up.

(b) *Germany.*—William I proclaimed at Versailles German Emperor (18th January, 1871). Confederation of twenty-five German states formed, under leadership of Prussia. Supremacy of Prussia complete.

IX. GREAT BRITAIN.—Isolated from Continental movements. Force of revolutions of 1830 and 1848 not felt; Reform proceeded on peaceful lines—Reform Acts of 1832, 1866, and 1884 the result of orderly agitation. Thus popular elements have been grafted into our constitution, while the monarchic and aristocratic elements have been preserved. The march towards democracy is still proceeding, the latest phase being the curtailment of the powers of the House of Lords by the Parliament (Veto) Act of 1911.

G. THE DECLINE OF SWEDEN, DENMARK, AND POLAND, AND THE RISE OF RUSSIA

No portion of European history is more perplexing than that which deals with the interaction of the northern kingdoms of Europe. But though we cannot enter into the details of this interaction we can at least follow its main lines and keep in view its tendency, namely, the expansion of Russia at the expense of the neighbouring Baltic states. We left Russia (see Mediaeval History Summary, Vol. II) consolidated under Ivan III (1462–1505), and expanding under Ivan IV (the "Terrible", 1533–1584), the first Russian rulers to assume the title "Czar"; Poland and Lithuania were united under Sigismund Augustus (1548–1572), the last male of the house of Jagellon, on whose death the Polish crown became elective; Sweden became independent under Gustavus Vasa (1524–1568); Denmark and Norway remained united after the secession of Sweden from the union of 1397. These four states had a common aim—supremacy over the Baltic, and this sea becomes the centre of conflicts as interesting and as vital to the importance of the countries concerned in them as the struggles of Persia, Greece, Macedon, Carthage, and Rome round the Mediterranean Sea. The mighty empire-building conflicts of the south in the centuries before Christ are re-enacted on a smaller scale in these nation-making and nation-breaking conflicts.

of the north in the centuries after Christ.

I. Northern Europe to the Accession of Peter the Great (1682) and Charles XII (1697).—Chief interest centres round the connection of Sweden with Denmark and with Poland.

(1) SWEDEN AND POLAND.

(a) Sweden the centre of Protestantism in N. Europe. Sigismund III, a Catholic, grandson of Gustavus Vasa, elected King of Poland (1587); his claim to crown of Sweden disputed by Charles, son of Gustavus Vasa, who became King of Sweden (1604). Thus, victory of Protestantism and defeat of Catholicism in N. Europe, Sigismund having had the support of Philip of Spain, the Emperor, and the Pope. Charles succeeded by Gustavus Adolphus (1611–1632).

(b) Dispute about Russian crown on death of Feodor, son of Ivan IV (1598). Swedish and Polish claimants. Russian patriots secured election of Michael Romanoff (1613), founder of Romanoff dynasty.

(c) Quarrel between Sweden (Gustavus Adolphus) and Poland (Sigismund III) regarding Estonia. Invasion of Livonia by Gustavus (1620), and commencement of his military fame. Truce with Poland, and intervention of Gustavus in the Thirty Years' War (*see supra*). Renewed Polish war under Charles X (1654–1660), who aimed at completing Swedish ascendancy on the Baltic. Flight of John Casimir, King of Poland (son of Sigismund III), before Charles, who forced the Elector of Brandenburg to acknowledge Swedish overlordship of Prussia. Recall of John Casimir by Poles, who were again defeated by Charles. Cause of Poles now espoused by Denmark, Russia, and Brandenburg. Denmark overrun by Charles, and Danes forced to make concessions. War ended by Treaties of Oliva (1660), Copenhagen (1660), and Kardis (1661); all Polish claims on Sweden renounced, and Prussia granted to the Elector of Brandenburg in complete independence (step in growth of Prussia). Balance of power of Baltic countries determined by these treaties—end of Danish domination in Baltic; beginning of greatness of Brandenburg and of decline of Sweden.

(2) SWEDEN AND DENMARK.—Danes did not acquiesce willingly in loss of Sweden (1524), and their command of the Straits leading to the Baltic enabled them to cripple Swedish commerce.

Wars between Sweden and Denmark under Charles IX, Gustavus Adolphus, Charles X (*see supra*), and

Charles XI (1660–1697). War under Charles XI was part of Louis XIV's war with Dutch (1672–1678), Sweden having seceded from Triple Alliance, and, at Louis XIV's dictation, having attacked Brandenburg, whose ally was Denmark. Swedish defeat at Fehrbellin (1675) and conquest of Pomerania by the Great Elector; Pomerania restored through the influence of Louis XIV.

II. Peter the Great (1682–1725) and Charles XII (1697–1718).—Rise of Russia and decay of Sweden.

(1) RUSSIA IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.—An Asiatic state, professing the Greek religion. Cut off from contact with the west by Sweden and Poland in the north, and by exclusion from the Black Sea in the south.

(2) AIMS OF PETER.

(a) External.—Expansion, to bring Russia into contact with European civilization. Three directions of this expansion following three rivers:—

(a) Towards Caspian Sea, following Volga—thus, Asiatic tendency. Russia “dwell in Asiatic twilight”.

(b) Towards Black Sea, following Dnieper—thus, Byzantine tendency. Russia aimed at Constantinople. (*See infra*, Eastern Question.)

(c) Towards Baltic Sea, following Neva—thus, European tendency. Chief aim of Peter, who “gorged everything western”.

(b) Internal.—Centralization, education, and progress. Three rivals of Peter:—

(a) Military.—The *Streltsi* disbanded; place taken by army on European model, the successor of which saved Europe from Napoleon.

(b) Ecclesiastical.—Office of Patriarch abolished, and Holy Synod set up (1721), in which Czar was supreme. Monasteries pruned.

(c) Social.—Old nobility replaced where possible by *parvenus*, and all nobles graded according to their state services.

Schools built, but no universities; a newspaper started; language fixed by foundation of a Russian Academy; women released from their Asiatic seclusion.

(3) SWEDEN UNDER CHARLES XII.—Charles succeeded to a strong government, a good army, and a great fleet. Conflict inevitable between Sweden and the other Baltic states, which had lost territory to Sweden—Poland had

lost Livonia and Esthonia, and the independence of Holstein had been guaranteed by Sweden, England, and Holland (1689) against the wish of Denmark.

(b) *Triple Alliance* of Russia, Denmark (Frederick IV), and Poland (Augustus II) against Sweden (1699).

(c) *Charles and the Alliance*.—Defeat of Frederick (Peace of Travendahl, 1700—Danish recognition of independence of Holstein), Peter (at Narva, 1700), and Augustus (at Pultusk, 1703) by Charles. Deposition of Augustus, and election of Charles's candidate, Stanislaus Leczinski, as King of Poland (crowned 1706).

Charles now at the zenith of his greatness, sought in alliance by both Louis XIV and Marlborough, who desired his help in the War of the Spanish Succession. But Russia was not yet subdued, and Charles marched on Moscow, having as his ally the Cossack, Mazeppa, who was aiming at independence of Russia.

(c) *Charles and Peter*.—Siege of Pultava by Charles, and complete defeat of the Swedish force by Peter (1709). Flight of Charles to Bender (1709–1714), under Turkish protection.

(4) EXPANSION OF RUSSIA UNDER PETER.

(a) *Towards Black Sea*.—Capture of Azov (1696), which had to be given up as a result of unsuccessful war with Turkey stirred up in his retirement by Charles XII (Treaty of the Pruth, 1711).

(b) *Towards Baltic Sea and Europe*.

(a) Journey of Peter through Germany to Holland and England (1697–1698). Artisans induced by him to settle in Russia.

(b) Conquest, during absence of Charles, of Livonia and Esthonia from Sweden, and capture of Riga and Revel.

(c) Foundation of St. Petersburg, “an eye looking into Europe” (1703), and growth of the city during the period of Swedish inactivity.

(d) Ambition of Peter to become a German prince by means of a Russian annexation of German provinces, which was to follow the marriages of his nieces to German princes. This ambition was doomed to failure, owing to the opposition of the Emperor Charles VI. Russian destiny did not lie in that direction.

(e) *Towards Caspian*.—War with Persia—Russian dominions extended to Caspian Sea.

(5) *PACIFICATION OF NORTHERN EUROPE (1719–1721)*.—Concluded after death of Charles XII (1718) between Sweden and Poland, Prussia, Denmark, and Russia (separate treaties).

(a) Augustus II restored in Poland.

(b) Part of Pomerania granted to Prussia.

(c) Schleswig became part of Denmark.

(d) Estonia and Livonia surrendered to Russia, which restored Finland to Sweden.

(6) *AN ESTIMATE OF PETER*.—“Undoubtedly the worst of the great men who have influenced the course of Christian history.”

(a) Peter succeeded in—

(a) Laying the foundation of the connection between Russia and Europe. He did not find his country Asiatic and leave it European; the work of centuries could not be undone in twenty years. Russia is rather a bridge between Europe and Asia.

(b) Extending Russian boundaries to the south.

(c) Repressing the forces of reaction in Russia.

(d) Remodelling the whole system of government.

(b) He failed—

(a) To create a strong naval power, or to provide a system of obtaining officers for the army which he created.

(b) To become a German prince.

(c) To provide a successor, or, in default, a rule of succession. He had his wife, Catherine, crowned Empress, but took no more definite step towards nominating his successor.

III. The Partitions of Poland.

—Decline of Poland due to internal anarchy, and avarice on the part of her neighbours, especially Russia and Prussia. Two of the chief European facts of the eighteenth century are the rise of Russia and the growth of Prussia (under Frederick the Great, 1740–1786).

(1) INTEREST OF OTHER STATES IN POLAND.

(a) *Prussia*.

(a) Desire to prevent permanence of Saxon dynasty in Poland (Augustus II, of Saxony, king 1697–1733).

(b) East Prussia, formerly a Polish possession, cut off from Brandenburg by Polish Prussia, which Frederick therefore coveted.

Modern History

- (γ) Protestant Prussia the ally of the Polish Protestants, Poland being a Catholic state and the centre of the Counter-Reformation in the north-east.
- (b) *Russia.*
 - (α) Poland a convenient centre for military operations.
 - (β) Russian claims on parts of Poland.
- (c) *Austria.*—Natural desire to support Saxon kings of Poland against Prussia.

(2) WAR OF THE POLISH SUCCESSION (1733-1735).—Caused by dispute for crown on death of Augustus II. Augustus III finally acknowledged, and Stanislaus Leczinski (see *supra*) deposed.

(3) FIRST PARTITION (1772).—Following death of Augustus III (1763).

- (a) *Candidates for Crown.*—Stanislaus Poniatowski (supported by Catherine II of Russia) and Frederick of Saxony. Death of Frederick (1763), who was succeeded in the electorate by his son, thirteen years old. Election of Stanislaus (1764)—a Russian triumph.
- (b) *Polish National Feeling roused.*—Confederation of Bar formed, in fear of the loss of Polish independence and religion.
- (c) *Conferences between Prussia, Russia, and Austria,* resulting in first partition.
 - (α) Russia—Livonia and part of Lithuania.
 - (β) Austria—Galicia.
 - (γ) Prussia—Polish Prussia.

(4) SECOND PARTITION (1793).—Discontent in Poland with foreign influence. Reform of Polish constitution under influence of French Revolution, in hopes of strengthening Poland. Aim of Frederick to gain Danzig and Thorn from the Poles, and Russian anger at the new constitution caused Prussian and Russian intervention. Second Partition arranged by these two powers, without reference to Austria. Austria compelled to acquiesce, being on the verge of the French Revolutionary Wars.

(5) THIRD PARTITION (1795).—Last struggle of Poles for independence under Kosciusko. Third Partition arranged amongst the three powers—Austria received Krakau, while Prussia received Warsaw.

(6) SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF POLAND.—Strong body of Polish national sentiment still exists. Settlement revised

in 1807, 1815, and 1846. Poland affected by policy of Holy Alliance (see *infra*). Rising of 1830 resulted in organization of Poland as a Russian province; rising of 1863 against conscription resulted in complete incorporation into Russia.

H. THE EASTERN QUESTION

A question due to the Turkish occupation of the Balkan Peninsula, and taking two main forms: (1) The relation of the Turks to the people in the buffer states (Bulgaria, &c.); (2) the fate of the Turkish dominions in Europe, and the desire of Russia and Austria to profit by the death of the “sick man”. It will be best here to indicate the chief aspects of the Turkish problem from its commencement.

Its earliest aspect was that of militant Mohammedanism. Three chief phases of this question:—

- (1) The Moors in Spain.
- (2) The Seljuk Turks and the Crusades.
- (3) The Ottoman Turks and the advance into Europe.

The first two concern the Middle Ages, and have already been outlined. It was the advance of the Ottoman Turks into Europe that opened up new problems, and that gave rise to the modern aspects of the Eastern Question. The chief divisions of the subject will be:—

- (1) Chief countries and races.
- (2) Commencement of Turkish Decline (1453-1699).
- (3) The Rise of Russia (1682-1821).
- (4) Greek Independence (1821-1829).
- (5) The Crimean War (1853-1856).
- (6) The Balkan Risings of 1875-1878.
- (7) The Eastern Question from 1878 to the present time.

I. Chief Countries and Races Concerned.

(1) TURKEY.—Turks not a nation, but a Mongolian, Mohammedan army of occupation in the midst of conquered peoples.

(2) THE SLAVONIC PEOPLES.—Aryans,

like the Greeks, Latins, Teutons, and Celts. Chief are Russians, Bohemians, Croatians, Servians, Dalmatians, and Poles.

(3) BULGARIANS.—A Mongolian (Tatar) race, which surprised Europe in the war of 1910–1913.

(4) RUSSIA.—Anxious first to gain territory round the Black Sea, and then to make sure of a safe outlet through the Bosphorus. People of same religion (Greek Church) as Balkan peoples.

(5) AUSTRIA.—Cut off from the north by the rise of Prussia, and forced to the south, with the object of increasing her seaboard.

(6) GREEKS.—An Aryan race, Christian in religion (Greek Church).

Known as the Eastern Question only since the beginning of the war of Greek independence, the problems presented have been virtually the same since the settlement of the Ottoman Turks in Europe. "This Eastern Question", said a Russian statesman, "is like the gout. Sometimes it attacks you in the leg, and sometimes in the hand. It is fortunate indeed that it does not often fly to the stomach."

II. The Commencement of Turkish Decline (1453–1699).

(1) FURTHER ADVANCE OF THE TURKS

)

(a) Repulse from Belgrade by John Huniades, regent of Hungary (1456). Capture of city would have opened Hungary, Germany, and the Rhine to the Turks.

(b) Treaty of Constantinople (1479) between Venice and the Turks. Venetian islands in Aegean (including Negropont), Greece, and Scutari given up to the Turks.

(2) SOLYMAN THE MAGNIFICENT (1513–1566).—"Master of many kingdoms, ruler in three continents, and lord of two seas." Turkish Empire at height of its power.

Capture of Belgrade (1521) and Rhodes (1526). King of Hungary slain at Mohacz (1526). But decline of Empire commenced even in lifetime of Solyman. Decline of Janissaries (military force raised from children of enslaved Christians, who were trained for war, and soon became the terror of their opponents)—tribute of children ceased.

(3) HOLY LEAGUE (Pope Pius V, Spain, and Venice) defeated Turks at naval battle of Lepanto (1571). But Cyprus became Turkish.

(4) BEGINNINGS OF TURKISH RETREAT (1656–1699).—Work of repelling Turks now fell to Hapsburgs, who thus rendered Europe great service.

(a) *Misgovernment at Constantinople* (1603–1656).—Sultans of this period were weak men, who were unable to take advantage of the troubles of Germany in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648).

(b) *Rise of the Koprili* (1656–1691).—Three members of the family—Mohammed, Achmet, and Mustafa—became Grand Viziers at Constantinople, and for a time arrested the decline of the Turkish Empire, which set in fully after the death of Mustafa (1691).

(c) *Venetian War*.—Peace made in 1669, Candia (last conquest of Islam from Christianity) becoming Turkish.

(3) *First Hungarian War* (1663–1664).—Attack on Hungary by Achmet Koprili. Defeat at St. Gotthard by Imperial and French forces under Montecuccoli. Treaty of Vasvar—suzerainty of Sultan over Transylvania acknowledged.

(y) *War with Poland*.—Revolt of Cossacks of the Ukraine against Polish yoke; assistance given to Cossacks by Turks. Heroic defence of Poland by John Sobieski (king 1674–1697)—cession of part of Ukraine district to Turks (1676).

(d) *Second Hungarian War*.—Revolt of Hungarians (under Tököl) against anti-Protestant policy of Hapsburgs; assistance given by Turks under Kara Mustafa, brother-in-law of Achmet Koprili. Alliance of John Sobieski with Emperor Leopold; siege of Vienna by Turks (1683) and complete defeat by Sobieski, who thus saved Christendom. Holy League of 1684 (Emperor, Poland, and Venice) formed against Turks. Conquest of Turkish Hungary and the Morea (1686), with Negropont. Treaty of Carlowitz (1699).—Hungary and princely title recovered by Emperor, with suzerainty over Transylvania; Morea given back to Venice; Turkish frontier reduced to Danube.

III. The Rise of Russia (1682–1821).

(1) *TURKISH RECONQUEST OF THE MOREA FROM VENICE* (1715).—But Turkish attempts to revenge Carlowitz met with no more success, and at the Treaty of Passarowitz the Turks

were merely confirmed in their possession of the Morea, which remained Turkish till Greece gained her independence (1821–1829).

(2) PETER THE GREAT (1682–1725).—(See *supra*.) Expansion of Russia began a new phase of the Eastern Question.

(3) SUCCESSORS OF PETER.—Chief were Elizabeth (1741–1762; recognition of Russia as a European power), Catherine II (1762–1796), and Alexander I (1801–1825; see Napoleonic Wars). Permanent hold obtained on Black Sea; object of house of Romanoff became acquisition of Constantinople. Landmarks:—

(a) *Treaty of Kutschuk Kainardji* (1774).—Crimea declared independent of Turkey (opening for Russian influence); Russian ships allowed free passage through Dardanelles, on Turkish waters, and on Danube. Thus, objects of Russia openly avowed, and a choice between two evils presented itself to Europe.—(a) the continuance of Turkish occupation of southeastern Europe; (b) the aggrandizement of Russia.

(b) *Partitions of Poland*.—Russian gains (see *supra*).

(c) *Russian Share in the Napoleonic Wars*.—(See *supra*.) Russia now a first-rank European power.

(d) *Frontier extended to the Pruth* by Alexander I, who declared that Russia had the sole right to intervene in Turkish affairs.

(4) CAUSES OF TURKISH WEAKNESS.

(a) Lack of racial and religious sympathy between conquerors and conquered.

(b) Independence of the Janissaries, which made and unmade sultans.

(c) Lack of unity in Empire itself—indepen-dence of pashas of outlying provinces; no adequate support of central authority; subject populations divided amongst themselves.

IV. Greek Independence (1821–1829).—Balkan risings in nineteenth century part of same movement towards nationalism (coincidence of states with nations) as risings in Belgium, Italy, and Germany.

(1) REVOLT OF YPSILANTI IN MOLDAVIA (1821).—Moldavia was nearest Balkan province to Russia, from which aid was expected. Absence of Russian assistance caused failure of rising.

(2) SPREAD OF REVOLT TO GREECE.—Consideration of European intervention discussed at Congress of Verona (1822—see *infra*); principles of Holy Alliance (championed by Metternich) prevailed, and Greeks were left to themselves.

(a) *British Sympathy*.—Canning, the opponent of Russian influence in Turkey, sympathized with Greeks, and Englishmen such as Lord Byron and Colonel Stanhope went to Greece to give active assistance.

(b) *Accession of Nicholas I of Russia* (1825–1855).—Policy of Russian non-intervention in Greece reversed; secret convention between Russia and Great Britain (Wellington the British agent) in favour of Greek independence. French assistance promised.—Treaty of London (1827) signed by the three powers.

(c) *Turkish Resistance*.—Overcome at Navarino (1827), which was regarded in Great Britain as “an untoward event”, Canning's successors not being prepared for such active steps. Russia now left alone to continue the contest.

(d) *Treaty of Adrianople* (1829).—Between Russia and Turkey.

(a) Danube navigation to be free.

(b) Neutral vessels to be allowed passage through Dardanelles.

(γ) Greece to be independent, but tributary to Turkey (Otho of Bavaria first king, 1829–1862).

(δ) Christian governors granted to Serbia, Moldavia, and Wallachia.

V. The Crimean War (1853–1856).

(1) COMMANDING POSITION OF RUSSIA IN EASTERN EUROPE.—Russia victorious over Turkey (1829) and over Poles (insurrection of 1830). Policy of Western powers now to maintain Turkish integrity as an offset against Russian predominance in the East.

(2) REVOLUTIONS OF 1848.—Russia undisturbed by them. Occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia by 40,000 Russian troops when movement reached the East.

(3) CAUSES OF CRIMEAN WAR.

(a) Quarrel respecting Greek and Latin Church rights in Palestine. Russia claimed to be natural protector of Greek Church.

(b) Russian ambition to dismember Turkey; the “sick man” of Europe. Great Britain to be bought off with Egypt (important for route to India) and Candia; Russia to be protector of Danubian and Balkan

states, which were to be declared independent. British refusal of proposal.

(4) COMBATANTS.—Russia against France (under Napoleon III) and Great Britain.

(5) EVENTS.—Centre of events was Sebastopol, besieged by French and British and defended by Russians. Battles of the Alma, Balaclava, and Inkermann (September, October, and November, 1854), and storming of the Redan and the Malakoff (September, 1855). Allies joined by Austrians and Sardinians.

(6) TREATY OF PARIS (1856).—Accepted by Great Britain, Russia, France, Austria, Prussia, and Sardinia. Chief terms as they affected—

(a) *Russia.*

- (a) Russian protectorate over Danubian states abolished.
- (b) No war fleet to be kept in Black Sea.
- (c) Sebastopol not to be re-fortified.

(b) *Turkey.*

- (a) New privileges granted to Christians, and old ones confirmed.
- (b) To be admitted to European Concert and privileges of International Law.
- (c) Integrity guaranteed by France, Austria, and Great Britain.
- (d) Navigation of Danube to be free.

(c) *Great Britain.*

- (a) Privateering to be abolished.
- (b) Neutral flag to protect from seizure enemy goods, except munitions of war.

In 1859 Wallachia and Moldavia, having elected the same prince, were united into one state, Roumania.

In 1862 Otho of Greece had to leave the country in consequence of a revolt. Accession of William George of Denmark (brother of Queen Alexandra, then Princess of Wales) in 1864, Great Britain conceding to Greece the Ionian Islands.

VI. The Balkan Risings of 1875–1878.—Renewal of Eastern Question.

(1) REVOLT IN CRETE (1866–1868) began the troubles.

(2) REVOLT IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, assisted by volunteers from Montenegro and Servia.

(a) *Cause.*—Hatred of Turkish rulers, and especially of tax collectors.

(b) *Bulgarian Atrocities of 1876.*—Rising in Bulgaria repressed with great cruelty. Intervention of Russia (Alexander II, 1855–1881), Russians being united to Bulgarians by racial and religious ties.

(c) *Russian Advance on Constantinople.*—Danube crossed, but Russians defeated at Plevna by Osman Pasha, who was, however, himself defeated at the same place (December, 1877). Russian entrance into Constantinople.

(d) *Treaty of San Stefano* (March, 1878).

(a) Independence of Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro recognized.

(b) Bulgaria to become an autonomous tributary state.

(c) Russia to recover Bessarabia.

(e) *Attitude of Great Britain.*—Russian influence regarded with mistrust. Demand for a European Congress. Eastern affairs excited much comment in England—emergence of Mr. Gladstone from retirement; speech on Blackheath denouncing Turks.

(f) *Congress of Berlin* (1878).—British representatives were Beaconsfield and Salisbury; former returned saying that he had brought “peace with honour”. Chief arrangements:—

(a) Independence of Montenegro, Servia, and Roumania.

(b) Bulgaria to be autonomous—boundaries were to be Danube and Balkans.

(c) Southern Bulgaria reconstituted as Eastern Roumelia—civil government independent under a Christian governor nominated by the Sultan and confirmed by the Powers.

(d) Bosnia and Herzegovina to be commissioned and occupied by Austria.

(e) Free navigation of Danube confirmed.

(f) Russia kept Batoum, Kars, and Bessarabia.

(g) Reforms to be introduced into Turkey.

(h) Cyprus to be occupied and administered by Britain.

VII. The Eastern Question from 1878 onwards.—The Berlin Treaty left much unsettled in the desires of the Eastern Christian peoples to attain complete independence, and steps have been taken towards this end since 1878.

(1) *BULGARIA.*—United to Eastern Roumelia (1885) in modified independence. Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg became prince (1885); recognized by Russia (1896). Complete independence as kingdom assumed (1908).

(2) *SERVIA.*—Prince Milan assumed royal title (1882), but was compelled to

abdicate (1889) in favour of his son, Alexander, who married Draga Mashin. Murder of Alexander and Draga (1903), and accession of Peter Karageorgevich, recognized by the Powers in 1906.

(3) ARMENIA.—Petition to Berlin Congress for a Christian governor. Reforms promised by Turkey in 1878 not carried out. Massacres of 1894 and 1895, followed by rising of Armenians in Constantinople, and fresh massacres.

(4) CRETE.—Divisions between Mohammedans and Christians, each of whom desired a governor of their own faith. Christians proclaimed union with Greece (1897)—result was Greco-Turkish War. Greeks unprepared—indemnity had to be paid to Turkey. Prince George of Greece made High Commissioner of Crete, but resigned in 1906. Annexed to Greece by Treaty of Bucharest (1913).

(5) MACEDONIA.—Reforms promised by Turkey in 1878 not carried out. Scheme drawn up in 1903 by Austria and Russia accepted by Turkey. Treaty of Bucharest (1913) divided it between Servia, Bulgaria, and Greece.

(6) ROUMANIA.—Under Charles of Hohenzollern and Carmen Sylva. Steady progress towards state unity and orderly government.

(7) MONTENEGRÖ.—Nicholas (ruler since 1860) granted a constitution (1905), and assumed royal title (1910).

(8) TURKISH REVOLUTION.—Propaganda of Young Turks successful in 1908; a Parliament summoned by Sultan; Abdul Hamid deposed in favour of his brother Mohammed V; expectations of constitutional reform disappointed. Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(9) TURCO-ITALIAN WAR.—Italy at war with Turkey over Tripoli 1911-1912; Peace of Ouchy (1912) gave Tripoli to Italy.

(10) BALKAN WARS, 1912-1913.—Servia, Greece, Bulgaria, and Montenegro at war with Turkey 1912; Turkey completely defeated; Servia, Greece, and Montenegro, joined by Roumania, at war with Bulgaria in 1913; Bulgaria completely defeated. Treaty of Bucharest (1913) reduced Turkey in Europe to part of Thrace.

I. THE UNITED STATES FROM 1789

The history of a progress towards—

- (1) Expansion in America itself.
- (2) Colonization abroad.
- (3) World power and influence.

Chief periods:—

I. Period of Consolidation (1789-1829).

Chief Presidents—Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams.

Questions:—

(1) FEDERALISM OR REPUBLICANISM.—Strong party against the federal union, desiring separate republican communities. Last phase of the question was settled in the Civil War of 1861-1865.

(2) ACQUISITION OF LOUISIANA (1803) and of Florida (1819) by purchase. Area of United States doubled. Prime necessity for acquisition of Louisiana was that it contained New Orleans.

(3) WAR WITH GREAT BRITAIN (1812-1814).

(a) Cause.—British Orders in Council; but war continued after their withdrawal.

(b) Events.—Duel between *Shannon* and *Chesapeake*; advance of Pakenham on New Orleans and of Ross on Washington.

(c) *Treaty of Ghent* (1814).—Right of search left unsettled.

(4) SLAVERY.—Question of legality of slavery in Louisiana. Impulse had been given to cotton growing in south by invention (1793) of Whitney's "cotton gin"; slaves needed for cotton industry, and also for work on sugar and tobacco plantations. Missouri Compromise of 1821—Missouri admitted to the Union, but only on condition that slavery should not exist west of the Mississippi and north of parallel 36° (southern boundary of Missouri).

(5) MONROE DOCTRINE.

(a) *Revolt of Spanish Colonies* after 1813.—Should the Holy Alliance cross the Atlantic and intervene in favour of reaction? Answer was

(b) *Monroe Doctrine*.—“America for the Americans”—any attempt on the part of a European state to gain territory in

America would be regarded by the United States Government as an unfriendly action. The Monroe Doctrine (Presidency of Monroe, 1817-1825) was undermined only when the United States began to adopt a world policy.

II. Period of Continentalism (1829-1898).—Development and end of Monroe Doctrine.

(1) INTRODUCTION OF RAILWAYS.—Railway lines have preceded movements of population, and have thus opened out the great west. Their influence on the expansion of the United States westwards can hardly be overrated.

(2) SPOILS SYSTEM introduced by Andrew Jackson (President 1829-1837)—system of removing Government officials and replacing them by his own supporters. The precedent thus set had a very undesirable effect on American public life. It has been said that Andrew Jackson "personified New America".

(3) FURTHER ANNEXATIONS.—Texas (1845) and Oregon (1846), each 300,000 square miles. Gold rush in 1848 to California; founding of San Francisco, then a village of 800 people. War with Mexico (1846-1848) resulted in acquisition of the territory.

(4) THE SLAVE QUESTION.—Now the great question of the day. Republican (anti-slavery) party *v.* Democratic (pro-slavery) party. Virtual victory for latter party in decision, in case of Kansas and Nebraska Territories, that inhabitants should choose whether they would enter the Union as a "free" state or as a "slave" state. Election of Abraham Lincoln (a Republican) as President (1861-1865). South claimed to secede on slavery question. Result was Civil War.

(a) Causes of the War.

(a) Slavery (South) *v.* Anti-slavery (North).

(b) State rights (South) *v.* the Federal Union (North).

(c) Free Trade (South) *v.* Protection (North).

Between South and North there was a racial difference; Southerners were descendants of Virginian planters, Northerners of New England Puritans.

(b) Character of the War.

(a) One of the greatest contests in the

history of the world, for the numbers engaged, the determination of the combatants, and the vast extent of the field of fighting.

(b) Able generalship of Southerners, due to many of generals being military students; Northerners were not prepared for war, and the inexperience of their generals caused great losses amongst the men.

(c) Use of earthworks as a protection against rifle fire.

(d) Secession of the Southern States.—South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas. Jefferson Davis chosen president (cf. Mr. Gladstone's declaration: "Jefferson Davis has created a nation") of the "Confederate States of America". Northern States known as "Federal States".

(e) Effect of War on Great Britain.

(a) Supplies of raw cotton stopped—result was Lancashire cotton famine.

(b) Question of privateering—Alabama question, settled by arbitration in 1872, Great Britain to pay £3,000,000 damages.

(f) End of Struggle.—Victory of wealthier and more populous North. Lee, the brave Southern leader, captured by Grant at Appomattox Courthouse (9th April, 1865); surrender of Johnston to Sherman (26th April, 1865). Davis captured in Georgia (11th May, 1865), and then released. Magnanimous treatment of vanquished South by victorious North.

(g) Results of War.—Marred by assassination of Lincoln (14th April, 1865).

(a) Slaves declared free.

(b) Union that of "a nation one and indivisible, not merely an alliance of independent peoples".

(5) FURTHER GROWTH under presidencies of Johnson, Grant, and Garfield, owing to the incorporation of such territories as West Virginia (1863), Nevada (1864), Nebraska (1867), and Alaska (purchased from Russia, 1867). Population doubled between 1865 and 1898.

(6) VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY QUESTION (1895-1897).—War imminent between Great Britain and United States. Monroe Doctrine still in force then.

(7) WAR WITH SPAIN (1897-1898).—Commencement of a new American policy—colonization.

(a) Cause.—Cuban insurrection and Spanish inability to restore order on request of President McKinley. American ship, *The Maine*, blown up.

- (8) *Treaty of Paris* (October, 1898).
 - (a) Cuba declared independent; under an American governor till 1909.
 - (b) Philippines and Porto Rico granted to United States.

The influence of the United States on the modern world has been very great. The republic is now a world power. The contrast between the America of the early nineteenth century and the America of the early twentieth century was exhibited in a striking manner by the European journey of President Roosevelt in 1910, when he was received by European public bodies, and commented in public on the policy of European powers. The problems of the United States are now mainly three:—

(1) *Geographical*, due to absence of natural boundaries on the north and south.

(2) *Economic*, similar to the problems of all other industrial countries.

(3) *Racial*, due to the large number of immigrants, and also to the presence of the negro element.

In whatever the nineteenth century did for mankind the United States had a great share, and now in the twentieth century, after emerging from the isolation of the Monroe Doctrine, the great industrial community of the western continent stands forth as a world power ready to give and to receive suggestions for the solution of all the problems which constitute the attraction, if at times the despair, of life in modern times.

NOTES ON HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

The following is only a limited selection of geographical names, mostly on the European Continent, of historical interest or significance.

AACHEN, or AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, city of Prussia, close to Dutch and Belgian frontiers; a chief place of Ripuarian Franks; Charlemagne's capital; German kings crowned here 9th to 16th century. First Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1668) ended War of Devolution; Second Peace (1748) ended War of Austrian Succession; Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818) confirmed Vienna settlement of Europe.

ACRE, coast town of Palestine; taken by Arabs 638; captured by Crusaders 1104; retaken by Saladin 1187; recovered by Richard I 1191; placed under Knights of St. John 1229 (whence name *St. Jean d'Acre*); finally lost by Christians 1291; captured from Arabs by Turks 1517; unsuccessfully besieged by Napoleon 1799; taken by Ibrahim, son of Mehemet Ali, 1832; taken by allied fleets of Powers (except France) and restored to Turkey 1840.

ADRIANOPOLE, third city of European Turkey, in Thrace; founded by Emperor Hadrian (whence name *Hadrianopolis, Hadrian's city*); Constantine defeated rival Licinius here 323; Goths defeated Romans and slew Emperor Valens 378; second city of Eastern Empire; taken by Turks 1361, and became their capital until 1453; occupied by Russia 1829 and 1878; taken by Bulgaria 1913, but soon recovered by Turks. Treaty of Adrianople (1829) settled war between Russia and Turkey, and secured independence of Greece and Servia.

AFRICA, applied by Romans specially to neighbourhood of Carthage (now Tunis), or more generally to all northern coast lands of continent except Egypt; name supposed to be derived from a tribe of Berbers; Roman province of Africa formed after destruction of Carthage (B.C. 146); conquered by Vandals (429-39); recovered under Justinian (533); conquered by Saracens (710).

AIX, town of southern France, near Marseilles; founded as *Aqua Sextiae* by Romans B.C. 122, and so named from its hot springs; Marius defeated Teutones who threatened

Italy in B.C. 102; capital of Provence in Middle Ages.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. See Aachen.

ALBANIA, country on west coast of Balkan Peninsula inhabited by Albanians, or Skipetar, who represent ancient Illyrians; independent kingdoms in 14th and 15th centuries; conquered by Turks in 1431-79; a kingdom of Albania again created in 1913.

ALEXANDRIA, great seaport of Egypt, founded by Alexander the Great, B.C. 331, and named after himself; became great centre of Hellenic and Jewish influence; passed under Roman rule on death of Cleopatra; taken by Persians 616 and by Saracens 642; taken by Napoleon 1798; French defeated by British in battle of Alexandria 1801; revived by Mehemet Ali; bombarded by British fleet 1882.

ALSACE, or ELSASS (German form), territory of German Empire, between Vosges Mountains and Rhine; originally inhabited by Celtic tribes and included in Gaul; later occupied by Teutonic Alamanni, then by Franks; passed under Empire and House of Austria; France gained Austrian rights by Treaty of Westphalia (1648); Louis XIV seized Strassburg in 1681, had it confirmed by Treaty of Ratisbon (1684) and Peace of Ryswyk (1697); other portions acquired subsequently; ceded to Germany after Franco-German War of 1870-1.

AMERICA, derived from the name of Amerigo Vespucci, a Florentine merchant who claimed to have made several voyages to New World from 1497 onwards; first used in a map by Waldseemüller in 1507; continent first reached from Europe by Norsemen in 11th century; real discovery by Columbus in 1492.

AMIENS, town of north-eastern France, on Somme, formerly chief town of Picardy; as *Samarobriva* was chief place of Belgic tribe Ambiani (whence name) in time of Cæsar; countship fell to Philip Augustus, King of France, 1185; passed by Treaty of Arras (1435) to Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy;

Notes on Historical Geography

finally added to France 1477; taken by Spaniards 1597, but soon recovered; taken by Germans, 1870 and 1914. Peace of Amiens (1802) made a truce in Napoleonic wars.

AMSTERDAM, capital of Holland, dating from 13th century; trade grew rapidly after Treaty of Westphalia (1648), which closed the Scheldt and depressed Antwerp; occupied by Prussians 1787 and by French 1795; became capital of Batavian Republic, then of Kingdom of Holland.

ANDALUSIA, district of southern Spain, consisting of the Guadalquivir Valley, with Seville as chief town; was province Baetica in Roman times; overrun by Vandals (whence Vandalusia, supposed to be original of name), Suevi, and Visigoths; seat of Moorish power 711-1492.

ANDORRA, semi-independent little state on Spanish side of Pyrenees, in 1278 recognized as under joint suzerainty of Spanish Bishop of Urgel and Count of Foix; latter now represented by France.

ANJOU, ancient countship of France, representing territory of Gallic tribe Andes or Andecavi, with Angers as capital; Count Geoffrey IV (1129-51) married Matilda, daughter of Henry I of England, and their son, Henry II, began the Angevin monarchy in England.

ANTIOCH, great city on Syrian coast, founded B.C. 300 by Seleucus Nicator, founder of the Seleucid Empire, and long a centre of Greek influence; came under Rome B.C. 64; cradle of Gentile Christianity; taken by Persians, 541; captured by Saracens 635, but recovered for Eastern Empire by Nicephorus Phocas 968; occupied by Seljuk Turks 1084; captured by Christians in First Crusade (1098) and was capital of Latin principality till 1268, when it fell to Egyptian Mamelukes.

ANTWERP, chief port of Belgium, on the Scheldt; dates from 4th century; chief port of Europe in first half of 16th century; "Spanish Fury" in 1576; "French Fury" in 1583; taken by Alexander of Parma in 1585; Treaty of Westphalia (1648) closed Scheldt and ruined its trade; taken by French from Holland 1832 and handed over to Belgium; Scheldt finally opened 1863.

AOSTA, Italian town in Piedmont, founded by Augustus as Augusta Praetoria (whence present name) after conquest of tribe Salassi in Cisalpine Gaul; at various times under Goths, Lombards, and Franks; became part of Burgundian kingdom; early came into hands of Dukes of Savoy, now Kings of Italy; only part of ancestral possessions kept by Italian royal house.

APULIA, district of south-eastern Italy, known by this name in Roman times; subdued by Rome B.C. 317; conquered by Lombards from Eastern Empire 668, but recovered in 10th century; conquered by Normans, who founded Duchy of Apulia, 1042; united to kingdom of Sicily 1127.

AQUILEIA, small village of Austrian Empire,

close to Italian frontier, at head of Adriatic Sea; founded as a Roman colony B.C. 181; became a great commercial and strategic centre and one of the largest cities of Italy; capital of Venetia under Augustus; taken and destroyed by Attila 452; never recovered.

AQUITAINA, historic name of south-western France; Aquitania was, in Caesar's time, a division of Gaul between Pyrenees and Garonne; Augustus extended the name over country between Pyrenees and Loire; largely occupied by Visigoths in 5th century; taken from Visigoths by Franks under Clovis 507-10, but never effectually controlled by Franks; conquered by Pepin the Short 760-8; duchy passed 1152 to Henry of Anjou (Henry II of England) by marriage with Eleanor, daughter of the Duke; later known chiefly as Gascony and Guienne, the latter a corruption of Aquitaine.

ARAGON, district of Spain in valley of Ebro, with Saragossa as chief town; formerly separate kingdom, originating in 11th century, including Catalonia and Valencia; acquired dominion over Balearic Isles, in southern France, in Sicily (by Sicilian Vespers, 1282), and in Sardinia; Alfonso V, the Magnanimous (1416-58), was also King of Naples; modern Spanish kingdom created by marriage of Ferdinand of Aragon with Isabella of Castile 1469.

ARLES, town of France, on Rhone, near mouth; as Arelate was a Roman colony; a favourite residence of Constantine; in hands of Visigoths at fall of Empire; for a time in hands of Saracens in 8th century; later became capital of kingdom of Arles (see *Burgundy*).

ARRAS, town of north-eastern France, capital of old province of Artois; as *Nemetocenna* was chief town of Atrebates (whence name), a Belgic tribe conquered by Caesar; taken by Vandals, then in hands of Franks; subject for long to Counts of Flanders; passed to Philip Augustus of France as marriage dowry; passed to Duchy of Burgundy 1384; under Hapsburgs from Treaty of Senlis (1403) till 1640, when it was taken by France; finally confirmed to France by Peace of the Pyrenees (1659); Treaties of Arras in 1435 and 1482.

ASIA, said to be derived from a root denoting *the rising sun*, that is, *the East*; Roman province of Asia formed of dominions in Asia Minor bequeathed to Rome by Attalus, King of Pergamum, B.C. 133; name Asia Minor does not appear till 5th century A.D., but not locally or officially used; Anatolia a recognized name for Asia Minor, originating in 10th century.

ASTURIAS, old province of north-western Spain, with Oviedo as chief town; owing to mountainous character never completely subdued by Romans or Goths and not conquered at all by Moors; Christian reconquest of Spain began from here; heir of Spanish crown is Prince of Asturias.

ATHENS, great city-state of ancient Greece and capital of modern kingdom; at summit of

imperial glory under Pericles in third quarter of 5th century B.C.; empire overthrown in Peloponnesian War by Sparta; came under Roman rule; philosophical schools closed by Justinian (529); after Latin conquest of Constantinople (1204) became a Latin lordship, later duchy; duchy taken by Grand Catalan Company 1311, and came to King of Sicily 1312; duchy conquered by Florentine house of Acciaiuoli 1385; taken by Turks 1458; taken by Venetians 1466 and 1487, but soon lost; taken by Greek insurgents 1821-2; recaptured by Turks 1826; capital of Greek kingdom since 1833.

AUGSBURG, town of Bavaria; founded as *Augusta Vindelicorum* by Augustus A.D. 14 after conquest of Rhætia; abandoned to Alamanni in 4th century; sacked by Huns; contested between Charlemagne and Duke of Bavaria; later in duchy of Swabia; free imperial city from 1276 till 1806, when it was annexed to Bavaria; seat of several Imperial Diets; taken by Gustavus Adolphus 1632. It gave name to Confession of Augsburg (1530), Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555), and Augsburg Alliance (1686).

AUSTRIA, used (also in form Austrasia) originally of eastern part of Frankish Empire (about Metz), as opposed to Neustria; later of East Mark (*Österreich* = east realm), founded by Charlemagne on middle Danube after conquest of Avars, about 800; refounded more effectually by Otto the Great 955; given to Babenberg family 976; created a duchy 1156; house of Babenberg extinct 1246; Habsburgs established in Austria 1282; created an archduchy 1453; Francis I assumed style Emperor of Austria 1804.

AVIGNON, city of south-eastern France, the *Avenio* of classical antiquity; included in kingdoms of Burgundy and Arles, later in countships of Provence and Toulouse; dismantled by Louis VIII of France for supporting Albigenses; residence of Popes during Babylonian Captivity 1309-77; sold to Pope by Joanna, Countess of Provence, 1348; taken from Papacy and annexed by France 1791.

BADEN, grand-duchy of German Empire, in south-west; became a margravate 1112; divided up, but all reunited 1711; Baden fought for Napoleon 1805, and obtained increase of territory; became grand-duchy 1806; revolution of 1848 overthrown by Prussians; supported Austria 1866 against Prussia; supported Prussia 1870.

BALEARIC ISLANDS, occupied successively by Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals (423), and Moors (798); separate Moorish kingdom 1009; conquered by Aragon 1232.

BARCELONA, large city and port of north-eastern Spain, capital of Catalonia; said to have been founded by Hamilcar Barca, the Carthaginian, in 3rd century B.C., and named from him *Barcino*; came under Rome in time of Augustus; in hands of Visigoths; taken by Moors 713; later under Franks; counts of Barcelona independent from 874; county united

to Aragon 1149, and city became great trading port; rebelled against Spain 1640, but subdued 1652; taken by French 1697, but restored by Treaty of Ryswyk same year; captured by Peterborough (1705) in War of Spanish Succession, and by French party 1714; taken by French in Peninsular War (1808); now a revolutionary centre.

BASEL (French, *Bâle*), second largest town of Switzerland, capital of a canton; named *Basilia* ("royal city") as residence of Emperor Valentinian I 374; in hands of Alamanni, then part of East Frankish kingdom, then in Burgundy, then included in Empire again; became free town in 14th century; nearly destroyed by earthquake 1356; joined Swiss Confederation 1501; a centre of Reformation under Zwingli. Council of Basel 1431-49. Peace of Basel (1499) virtually recognized Swiss independence of Empire. Treaty of Basel (1795) between France and Prussia.

BAVARIA, southern kingdom of German Empire, so called from name of tribes who settled there in 5th and 6th centuries; subject to Franks, but with own Duke till time of Charlemagne; included in eastern Frankish kingdom at division; ravaged by Magyars in 907; Duke Henry the Quarrelsome deposed by Otto II 976 but restored 985; duchy passed to Welfs or Guelphs 1070; given to Otto of Wittelsbach 1180; occupied by French 1795; sided with Napoleon, 1805, and made a kingdom; supported Austria against Prussia 1866; supported Prussia against France 1870 and joined new Empire.

BELGIUM, named from the *Belgæ*, a group of tribes mentioned by Cæsar as inhabiting north-eastern Gaul; later conquered by Salian Franks; included in the middle kingdom at the partition of Verdun (843); became later duchy of Lower Lorraine, and afterwards split up into duchy of Brabant, county of Flanders, &c.; came under Burgundian rule in 15th century, culminating in Charles the Bold, who was overthrown at Nancy in 1477; marriage of Charles's daughter to Maximilian of Austria began Hapsburg-Spanish period; revolt of 16th century against Spain under William of Orange resulted in separation of Holland from Belgium at Union of Utrecht (1579); passed from Spain to Austria at Treaty of Utrecht (1713); conquered by France during the Revolution; at Vienna settlement of 1815 joined to Holland, but revolted 1830 and became separate kingdom; overrun by Germany, 1914.

BELGRADE, capital of Servia, at junction of Save with Danube; founded by Celts 3rd century B.C. and long called *Singidunum*; taken by Romans, then by Huns, Goths, &c.; recovered for Empire by Justinian; occupied by Bulgarians from 9th century, by Magyars in 12th century; taken by Turks 1521; held by Austrians 1688-90, 1717-39, 1789-92; finally evacuated by Turkey and became Servian capital, 1866; bombarded by Austria, 1914.

BENEVENTO, town of Campania, in Italy, an old Samnite city; taken by Romans when Samnites were finally conquered; Pyrrhus

Notes on Historical Geography

finally defeated here (B.C. 275); became a separate Lombard duchy in 6th century, and maintained independence at Frankish conquest in 8th century; passed to Papacy; united to kingdom of Italy 1860.

BERLIN, capital of Prussia and German Empire; dates from 13th century; occupied by Russians 1760, by Napoleon 1806-8, again by French 1812-3; Liberal revolution 1848. Treaty of Berlin (1878) dealt with Eastern Question.

BERN, capital of Swiss canton Bern and of Swiss Confederation; founded by Duke of Zähringen 1191; became free imperial city 1218; entered Swiss Confederation 1353; accepted Reformation 1528.

BESANÇON, town of eastern France, as *Vesontio* chief place of the Sequani; taken by Caesar; in county of Burgundy, or Franche-Comté, but a free imperial city 1189-1651; passed to France with Franche-Comté at Peace of Nîmes (1679).

BOHEMIA, kingdom of Austrian Empire, so named from Boii, a Celtic tribe which formerly inhabited it; conquered by Teutonic Marcomanni, ultimately by Slav Czechs in 5th century; kingdom dates from 1198, when Ottakar II was ruler; Ottakar II conquered Austria, Carinthia, &c., but was defeated and slain at Marchfeld (1278) by Rudolf of Hapsburg; kingdom came to Austrian Hapsburgs 1526; ever since in their possession.

BORNHOLM, Baltic island belonging to Denmark; has been at various times independent viking centre, fief of archbishop of Lund, possession of Hanseatic League, Danish possession, Swedish possession (1645), and since 1660 Danish.

BOURGES, town of France, once as *Avaricum* chief city of Gallic tribe Bituriges (whence name); taken by Caesar; in hands of Visigoths 475-507; capital of Berry in Middle Ages; headquarters of Charles VII ("King of Bourges") when English occupied France.

BRABANT, province of Belgium with Brussels as capital, also a province (North Brabant) of Holland; name that of a duchy originating 1190 out of duchy of Lower Lorraine; joined to duchy of Burgundy 1430; war against Spain left part to United Provinces, part to Spain, latter becoming ultimately part of Belgian kingdom.

BRANDENBURG, province of Prussia, bearing name of former margrave and elector of Holy Roman Empire; originally a mark against Slavs; Albert the Bear took title Margrave of Brandenburg 1150; Hohenzollern rule began 1415; Frederick William, "Great Elector", 1640-88; Elector Frederick III became first King of Prussia as Frederick I 1701. See *Prussia*.

BREDA, old Brabant town, now in Holland; taken by Maurice of Nassau from Spaniards 1590; taken by Spinola for Spaniards 1625; recaptured by Frederick Henry of Orange 1637; passed finally to Holland 1648. Peace of Breda (1667) between England and Holland.

BREISACH, town of German Empire, in Baden, on Rhine, long one of the chief frontier fortresses of Germany; stronghold of Gallic Sequani as *Mons Brisiacus* (whence name); fortified by Emperor Valentinian 369; taken by Bernard of Weimar 1638, and annexed to France 1648; restored to Austria by Peace of Ryswyk (1697); again became French 1703, but restored to Austria at Peace of Rastatt (1714); taken again by French 1744; Peace of Pressburg (1805) gave it finally to Baden; suffered heavily in Franco-German War.

BREMEN, port of German Empire, capital of a small free state; bishopric founded by Charlemagne; town admitted to Hanseatic League 1283, excluded 1285, readmitted 1358, excluded 1427, readmitted 1433; adopted Reformation and joined Schmalkaldic League; bishopric passed to Sweden at Peace of Westphalia (1648); bishopric passed to Hanover 1705, and town recognized as a free city; taken by French 1806 and annexed by Napoleon; again independent 1815; joined North German Confederation 1867 and German Empire 1871.

BRESLAU, town of Prussia, capital of province of Silesia; founded as Slavonic town before 1000; part of Poland for a time, then independent duchy; came to Bohemia 1335, and passed to Hapsburgs 1526; annexed to Prussia by Frederick the Great in Seven Years' War.

BRITTANY, or **BRITANNY**, so named from Britons who crossed the sea to people it when Angles and Saxons invaded Britain; north-east Celtic division of France; Bretons repelled Norman invaders; became duchy 992; duchy joined to France by marriage 1491.

BRUGES, city of Belgium, in Flanders; ancient city, in 14th century chief commercial centre of northern Europe; lost its position through silting of river and other causes; again a seaport through making of a ship canal.

BRUNSWICK, duchy of German Empire; territory belonged to Henry the Proud, Duke of Saxony, in 12th century, then under his son Henry the Lion; duchy created 1235 in family of Welf; split up 1267 into two duchies of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel and Brunswick-Lüneburg, latter becoming electorate and then kingdom of Hanover (which see); duchy was part of Napoleon's kingdom of Westphalia.

BRUSSELS, capital of Belgium, and after 1383 capital of ancient duchy of Brabant; came with Brabant under Dukes of Burgundy in 15th century, then under Hapsburgs; since 1830 capital of Belgian kingdom; occupied by Germany, 1914.

BULGARIA, named from Bulgars, a people akin to Tatars, Huns, and Finns, who settled in ancient Moesia in 7th century; became Christian in 9th century; Bulgarian empire under Simeon (893-927), and again under Samuel (976-1014); greatest ruler was Ivan Asen II (1218-41); under Turkish rule 1396-1878; made autonomous in latter year; declared independent kingdom 1908.

a name of various historical

application, derived from the Burgundians, a Teutonic people from the region of the Oder and Vistula who settled and formed a kingdom on upper Rhine about 407; defeated by Aëtius 437 and settled in Savoy, with Besançon, Lyons, Langres, Vienne, Geneva as chief towns; their kingdom conquered by Franks 534. Kingdom of Provence or Cisjuran Burgundy founded in south-eastern France 879, and that of Transjurian or Juran Burgundy in western Switzerland 888; the two united 933 and became later known as kingdom of Arles; passed to Empire 1033. Duchy of Burgundy founded after Treaty of Verdun (843) in part of ancient Burgundy left to western Frankish kingdom, west of Saône (with Dijon as chief town); duchy given to Robert, brother of Henry I of France, 1032, and continued in Capetian line till 1361; in 1363 duchy conferred on Philip the Bold, son of John King of France; duchy greatly extended by Charles the Bold, but overthrown by his defeat and death at Nancy 1477; this duchy became a French province. For county of Burgundy see *Franche-Comté*

CADIZ, port of southern Spain, founded by Phoenicians 1100 B.C. and occupied by Carthaginians about 500 B.C.; taken by Rome from Carthage; a great and flourishing city till destroyed by Visigoths in 5th century A.D.; captured by Alfonso X of Castile from Moors 1262, and rebuilt; trade flourished again after discovery of America; attacked by British 1587, 1596, 1625, 1702; blockaded by British fleet 1797-8 and bombarded by Nelson 1800.

CALABRIA, in Roman times a district in the heel of Italy, now a province in the toe; transference of name took place after Lombards had conquered ancient Calabria in 7th century.

CALAIS, town of north-east France; taken by Edward III in 1347 and remained with English till 1558; taken by Spaniards 1596 but restored to France at Peace of Vervins 1598.

CAMBRAI, town of north-east France, anciently *Camaracum*, a town of the Gallic tribe Nervii; later under Franks; included in Charles the Bold's dominions and came on his death to Louis XI of France, who gave it to Emperor; finally assigned to France by Peace of Nîmes (1679). League of Cambrai (1508) against Venice comprised France, Empire, and Pope. Peace of Cambrai (1529) between France, Empire, and England.

CAPUA, town of Campania, one of the most important places in ancient Italy, destroyed by Saracens 840, and never revived; modern Capua occupies site of ancient Casilinum, a few miles off.

CARTAGENA, seaport of south-eastern Spain, founded by Carthaginians 243 B.C. as *Carthago Nova* or *New Carthage* (whence name); taken by Romans 210 B.C.; nearly destroyed by Visigoths 425; fell to Moors, but finally conquered from them 1276.

CASTILE, ancient kingdom of Spain, represented by provinces of Old Castile and New

Castile; by union with Leon and Aragon and by conquest from Moors gradually expanded into Spanish monarchy. See *Aragon*.

CATTARO, port of Dalmatia, in Austrian Empire, on east coast of Adriatic; founded 2nd century B.C.; plundered by Saracens 840 and by Bulgarians 1102; under Servian protection as an independent republic for two centuries till 1389; under Venice from 1420; passed to Austria by Treaty of Campo Formio 1797; to Italy by Peace of Pressburg 1810; incorporated in French Empire 1810; to Austria since 1814.

CEUTA, Spanish town on coast of Morocco, opposite Gibraltar; originally a Carthaginian colony, then a Roman colony; under Vandals, but recovered by Justinian; taken by Visigoths 618; fell to Arabs 711; taken by Portuguese 1415; passed to Spain 1580.

CHÂLONS-SUR-MARNE, town of north-eastern France, representing ancient chief town of the Gaulish tribe Catalauni (whence name); near it the Huns under Attila were defeated in the historic battle of 451.

CLEVES, town of Prussia, near Dutch frontier, seat of a former duchy, which was united with those of Jülich and Berg 1521; disputed succession in 1609 preceding Thirty Years' War; Cleves assigned to Brandenburg (later Prussia) by Treaty of Xanten (1614).

COBLENZ, town of Prussia, at confluence of Rhine and Moselle (whence old name *Confluentes*, corrupted to Coblenz); founded as military post by Romans B.C. 9; later a residence of Frankish kings; from 1018 to 1794 belonged to Archbishop of Trier, one of the Imperial Electors; taken by French 1794, by Russians 1814; to Prussia since 1815.

COLOGNE, large town of Prussia, on Rhine; Roman colony founded here by Emperor Claudius, A.D. 50, and named from his wife *Colonia Agrippina* (whence name of town); came under Franks; archbishop was an elector of the Empire; archbishopric secularized 1801; joined Hanseatic League 1201; occupied by French 1794, and incorporated in France 1801; to Prussia since 1815.

CONSTANCE, town of German Empire, in Baden, on Lake of Constance, on Swiss frontier; see of important prince-bishop from 6th century to 1821; imperial free city 1192; in Protestant Schmalkaldic League 1530, but annexed to Austria 1548 and Protestantism suppressed; came to Baden at Peace of Pressburg (1805). Council of Constance (1414-8).

CONSTANTINOPLE, capital of Turkish Empire; founded 330 by Constantine the Great by enlargement of Byzantium as capital of Roman Empire; attacked by Avars 627, by Saracens 673-7 and 718, by Bulgarians 813 and 913; taken by Crusaders in Fourth Crusade 1204 and became seat of Latin Empire; recovered by Greeks 1261; taken by Turks 1453. Councils of Constantinople in 381, 553, 680-1, and 869 regarded as ecumenical by Latin Church.

Notes on Historical Geography

CORDOVA, town in southern Spain, originally Carthaginian, then a great city under Romans and under Visigoths; in 756 became under Moors capital of separate Caliphate; taken by Castile 1236; sacked by French 1808.

CORSICA, island in Mediterranean belonging to France; in early times Etruscan, then Carthaginian, then Roman; conquered by Vandals 469; by Eastern Empire 534; ravaged by Goths and Lombards; conquered by Charlemagne 774; repeatedly attacked by Moors in 9th century and occupied for a time; time of feudal anarchy followed; under rule of Pisa 1190; passed to Genoa 1347; contested between Aragon and Genoa; first French attack 1553, unsuccessful; proclaimed an independent kingdom under Theodore I 1736; subdued by France 1738-9 on behalf of Genoa; sold by Genoa to France 1768; occupied by Britain 1794-6; taken by France 1796; again occupied by Britain 1814; French since 1815.

CRACOW, town of Austrian Empire, in Galicia, from 1305 to 1764 coronation and burial-place of the kings of Poland; Cracow made a free republic 1815; annexed by Austria 1846.

CRETE, Greek island in Mediterranean; seat of a civilization before 2000 B.C.; subdued by Romans 67 B.C.; taken by Saracens 826; reconquered for Eastern Empire 961; under Venice 1204 to 1669, when it fell to the Turks; name Candia used by Venetians; revolt against Turks 1821, but island not freed; ceded to Egypt 1832; again under Turks 1840; insurrection 1866 suppressed, but some autonomy granted in 1868; under Prince George of Greece as High Commissioner 1888; annexed to Greece 1913.

CRIMEA, Russian peninsula on Black Sea, originally occupied by Celtic Cimmerians, then by Scythians; colonized by Greeks; then under King of Pontus; became tributary to Rome; overrun by Goths, Huns, Tatars, and Mongols; Genoese seized Venetian settlements here in 13th century; conquered by Turks 1475; annexed by Russia 1783; Crimean War 1854-6.

DALMATIA, kingdom of Austrian Empire, on east coast of Adriatic; conquered by Romans A.D. 9; under Odoacer and Theodosius; conquered by Justinian 535; Slavonic immigration in 7th century, but not affecting the city-states; Hungarian conquest 1102, but Venice remained suzerain in Zara, &c.; Venice master of all except independent Ragusa 1420; all Turkish by 1540 except maritime cities; Peace of Carlowitz (1699) gave Dalmatia to Venice; Peace of Campo Formio (1797) gave it to Austria; to France by Peace of Pressburg (1805); finally Austrian since 1815.

DANZIG, seaport of Prussia, of ancient origin; under Teutonic Knights 1308; a member of Hanseatic League; to Poland 1454, but as a free city; taken by Russians and Saxons 1734; came to Prussia 1793; Napoleon again made it a free city; restored to Prussia 1814.

DIJON, town of eastern France, the capital of the old duchy of Burgundy (which see).

DUNKIRK, port of north-eastern France, in

ancient Flanders, whose fortunes it shared; Turenne gained victory here 1658 over Condé and Don Juan, and town was given to England; Charles II sold it back to France 1662; fortifications demolished under Treaty of Utrecht (1713); British attack failed 1703; name means "church of the dunes".

DURAZZO, capital of Albania; as Ep. was a Greek colony founded 7th century B.C.; a dispute regarding it between Corinth and Coreya was a cause of Peloponnesian War; Romans called it Dyrrachium (whence modern name); Robert Guiscard and his Normans defeated forces of Eastern Empire here 1081, and took the town; afterwards came to Venice (1202) and Charles of Anjou (1268); became independent duchy under Angevin rulers; fell to Serbia 1330 and again to Venice 1344; to Turks 1501; included in Albanian kingdom

E, or NEGROPONT, Greek island, prominent in ancient Greek history; in Latin hands after Latin conquest of Constantinople 1120-41; conquered by Venice 1308; taken by Turks 1470; became part of Greece 1830.

EUROPE, from a root denoting *the sun or the West*, in distinction from Asia.

FINLAND, grand-duchy in Russian Empire, named from the Finns, a non-Aryan people who occupied it in 7th or 8th century; conquered and Christianized by Sweden 1157; ceded to Russia 1809.

Flanders, ancient district of *Frankish country* now mainly in Belgium, but partly in Holland and France, with Bruges and Ghent as chief towns; at Treaty of Verdun (843) assigned to Charles the Bald's western Frankish kingdom; made a margravate by Charles the Bald and became a county in 10th century; passed with rest of Netherlands to Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, in 1384; then under Hapsburgs; part assigned to independent Holland by Treaty of Westphalia (1648); parts to France by Peace of Pyrenees (1659), Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1668), and Peace of Nimeguen (1679); incorporated in France 1795-1814.

FLORENCE, city of Italy, capital of Tuscany; founded in Roman times; occupied by Goths and Lombards; scene of many struggles between Guelphs and Ghibellines in Middle Ages; frequently at war with Pisa and Siena; became a great banking centre; under the Medici 1434-1737, especially Lorenzo the Magnificent, 1469-92, but with interruptions; Savonarola, moral and political reformer, executed 1498; lost her liberty and became capital of grand-duchy of Tuscany 1531; grand-duchy passed from Medici to Francis, Duke of Lorraine, 1737; annexed with Tuscany to French Empire 1808; made capital of kingdom of Etruria by Napoleon 1809; grand-duchy restored 1814; annexed to kingdom of Sardinia 1859; capital of kingdom of Italy 1865-71.

FRANCE, representing the ancient name *Vancia*, denoting the territory of the Franks,

but applied now only to the western part of their territory, covering most of ancient Gaul; the kingdom developed from a small duchy with Paris as its centre and gradually absorbed all the feudal dependencies.

FRANCHE-COMTÉ, meaning *free county*, a name historically applied to the county of Burgundy, lying east of the duchy of Burgundy, and having Dôle as chief place; secured to France by Peace of Nimeguen (1679), and Besançon made capital of new province.

FRANCONIA (German, *Franken*), name of certain districts in Bavaria, representing a survival of the name of the ancient East Frankish Empire; during the Middle Ages there was a duchy of Franconia.

FRANKFORT-ON-MAIN, town of Prussia; comes into notice in time of Charlemagne; became place of election of German kings (or emperors); fell to French in Revolution and made by Napoleon capital of a grand-duchy; in 1815 became again a free city, and in 1816 became seat of German Confederation; seat of German National Parliament 1848; supported Austria 1866 and was annexed to Prussia. Treaty of Frankfort (1871) ended Franco-German War.

GENEVA, city of Switzerland, capital of canton of same name; mentioned by Cæsar as a town of the Allobroges; belonged to Burgundian kingdom in 5th and 6th century, and fell to Franks 534; came with Burgundy to Empire 1032; later often in conflict with its prince-bishop, and gradually established its civic privileges; came into relations with the Swiss 1530; adopted Protestantism 1535 and became Calvin's home; repelled final attempt of Savoy to take it 1602; annexed to France 1798; again independent 1813; entered Swiss Confederation 1815.

GENOA, ancient city of Italy; a powerful naval and commercial republic in the Middle Ages; long rivalry with Pisa ended by crushing of Pisa at Battle of Meloria (1284); then constant conflict with Venice, a rival commercial power; under French for a time, but became independent republic 1528 under Andrea Doria; made the Ligurian Republic under Napoleon, and then annexed to his Empire; given to kingdom of Sardinia 1815.

GERMANY, in Latin *Germania*, name given by Tacitus and other Roman writers to country inhabited by various peoples east of Gaul; in French the word is *Allemagne*, representing the name of the famous tribe or confederation of Alamanni; the German word is *Deutschland*, containing same root as *Teuton*.

GHENT, town of Belgium, formerly capital of Flanders; at one time a great centre of industry and commerce; absorbed in Burgundy with rest of Flanders; Charles V suppressed all its privileges 1540 to punish it for a disturbance; often taken in the religious and other wars; included in Austrian Netherlands 1713; annexed to France 1794; in kingdom of Netherlands 1814; in Belgian kingdom since 1830.

Treaty of Ghent (1814) ended war between Britain and United States.

GIBRALTAR, British fortress in south of Spain at entrance to Mediterranean; as Calpe was in ancient times one of the Pillars of Hercules; taken by Arabs 711; captured by Spanish 1309; recovered by Mohammedans 1333; again taken by Christians 1462; taken by British and Dutch 1704, and annexed to Britain; withstood a great siege 1779-83 successfully.

GRANADA, town and province of southern Spain; under the Vandals in the 5th century and under the Arabs from the 8th century; became a distinct Moorish kingdom, whose overthrow in 1492 ended Moslem rule in Spain.

GREECE, name of a kingdom of south-eastern Europe; derived from the name of a tribe in Epirus (southern Albania) and applied to whole country by Romans; classic Greek name was *Hellas*, and of people *Hellenes*, and these names are used by Greeks to-day.

GRENOBLE, town of south-eastern France, whose name is a corruption of *Gratianopolis* ("Gratian's town"), applied in honour of Emperor Gratian; under Burgundians and Franks, and then included in kingdom of Arles or Provence, which ended 1032; passed with rest of its district (called Dauphiné) to France 1349.

HAINAUT, province of Belgium, continuing name of a former countship; at one time part of central kingdom of Lotharingia, later included in duchy of Lorraine; passed under House of Burgundy in 15th century and afterwards shared fate of the southern Netherlands.

HAMBURG, seaport of Germany, capital of a small free state of the Empire; originated in a fortress founded by Charlemagne; a chief member of the Hanseatic League; free imperial city from 1510; joined Schmalkaldic League 1536; joined North German Confederation 1866, and German Empire 1871; joined German Customs Union 1888.

HANOVER, town of Prussia; formerly capital of a duchy representing one of the branches of the House of Brunswick; from 1692 capital of electorate of Brunswick-Lüneburg; elector became also King of Britain 1714 (George I); kingdom of Hanover constituted 1814; separated from British crown on accession of Queen Victoria 1837; supported Austria 1866, and consequently annexed by Prussia.

HEIDELBERG, town of Baden, in Germany; formerly capital of the Electors Palatine; several times taken during Thirty Years' War; sacked by French 1688 and 1693; annexed to grand-duchy of Baden 1803.

HESSE, grand-duchy in German Empire; name represents that of a Frankish tribe, the Hessi; became a landgrave 1265; Landgrave Philip Protestant leader in Germany 1509-67; Hesse divided at his death among his four sons; Hesse-Cassel and Hesse-Homburg annexed by Prussia 1866; Hesse-Darmstadt remains a separate state of the Empire under simple name Hesse.

Notes on Historical Geography

HOLLAND, kingdom including territory of a former countship; county of Holland dates from about 1083; passed under House of Burgundy 1436, thence to Hapsburgs; independence secured under Union of Utrecht 1579; conquered by France 1795 and Batavian Republic established; made a kingdom by Napoleon 1806; kingdom of Netherlands created 1814, but Belgium broke off 1830.

HOLSTEIN, part of Prussian province of Schleswig - Holstein; formerly a duchy belonging to Denmark but held as a fief of the Empire; annexed by Prussia after wars 1864-6.

HUNGARY, kingdom included in Austrian Empire; founded by Magyar invaders about 895; was long the great bulwark of Christendom against the Turks; overthrown by Turks 1526 at Battle of Mohács, and became associated with Austria; revolted 1848 but repressed with Russian help; autonomy fully recognized by Austria 1867.

ITALY, name used both in ancient and modern times for central peninsula projecting from Europe into Mediterranean; united under ancient Rome, but split up into many states from fall of Western Empire till reunion in 19th century under Piedmontese kingdom of Sardinia.

LA ROCHELLE, seaport of western France; dates from at least 10th century; a great Huguenot centre during the Religious Wars; subdued by Richelieu 1628.

LEON, province of Spain, representing an ancient Christian kingdom; kingdom dated from 913, and was finally united with Castile 1230.

LIECHTENSTEIN, small independent state between Switzerland and Austria, closely associated with latter; created a principality 1719; under Holy Roman Empire 1719-1806, and German Confederation 1815-66; independent since 1866.

LIÉGE, town of Belgium; dates from 6th century; constant struggles for rights against its powerful bishops; sacked by Charles the Bold 1468; taken by Marlborough 1702; annexed to France 1794; in kingdom of Netherlands from 1815, and that of Belgium since 1830; taken by Germany, 1914.

LISBON, capital of Portugal; known to Romans as *Olísipo* (whence modern name), also called *Ulyssippo* from a legend that Ulysses founded it; after occupation by Vandals and Visigoths, was taken by Moors 711; taken by Portuguese kingdom from Arabs 1147; burned by Castilians 1373; destroyed by earthquake 1755.

LOMBARDY, division of northern Italy, perpetuating the name of the Lombard invaders, who founded a kingdom in Italy 568; Lombard kingdom overthrown by Charlemagne 774.

LORRAINE (German, *Lothringen*), derived from Lotharingia, name of the middle kingdom allotted in 855 to Lothair, a son of the Emperor Lothair I, who had received the

central lands of the Carolingian Empire along with Italy and Provence at the partition of Verdun (843); this original Lotharingia included Holland, Belgium, parts of Rhenish Prussia and Switzerland, besides the country now called Lorraine (around Metz); duchy of Lorraine created 925; divided into two duchies, Lower and Upper Lorraine, about 965, former becoming later duchy of Brabant (now in Belgium); Upper Lorraine or Lorraine proper in hands of France 1678-97; annexed to France 1766; taken by Germany 1870.

LÜBECK, town of German Empire, capital of a small free state; made a free city of Empire 1226; long head of Hanseatic League; sacked by French 1806; annexed by Napoleon 1810; free town of German Confederation 1815; in North German Confederation 1866; in German Empire since 1871.

LUXEMBURG, independent grand-duchy on frontiers of Belgium and Germany, and also an adjacent province of Belgium; became a countship 1060 and a duchy 1354; in French hands 1795-1815; made grand-duchy 1815 under King of Netherlands; on accession of Queen Wilhelmina in Holland 1890 Luxembourg passed to a male kinsman.

LYONS, town of France; founded as *Lugdunum* (whence name) by Greek refugees 59 B.C.; Roman colony established 43 B.C.; capital of Burgundian kingdom 478; French kings established authority 1312.

MACEDONIA, region in Balkan peninsula, now divided between Servia, Bulgaria, and Greece; seat of kingdom of Philip and his son Alexander the Great in ancient times; came under Roman sway; devastated by Goths and Avars; settled by Slavonic races down to 7th century; Bulgarians conquered Slavs in 9th century; under Eastern Empire from 1014 till Latin conquest of Constantinople (1204); under Bulgarian rule 1234-1330; under Servian rule 1300-55; Turkish conquest from 1389 to 1428; lost to Turkey by Treaty of Bucharest (1913), ending wars among Balkan States.

MADRID, capital of Spain; taken from Moors 1083; made capital of Spain 1560.

MAINZ (French, *Mayence*), town of German Empire, in Hesse; founded by Romans as *Maguntiacum* (whence modern name); became see of an important archbishop, who was an elector of the Empire; free city from 1118; taken during Thirty Years' War by Swedes 1631, and by French 1644; again taken by French 1688; welcomed French 1792; given to Hesse 1815.

MALTA, British island in Mediterranean; in Phoenician, Carthaginian, and Roman hands successively; taken by Arabs 870; taken by Normans from Sicily 1090; then under Angevin and later the Aragonese rulers of Sicily; Knights of St. John granted Malta by Emperor Charles V 1530; Turkish attack repulsed 1565; taken by Napoleon 1798; taken by British 1799; secured to Britain 1814.

MARSEILLES, chief seaport of France; founded

as Greek colony (*Massilia*) 600 B.C.; annexed with Provence to France 1481.

METZ, town of Germany, in Alsace-Lorraine, chief town of Lorraine; existed under Romans as a Gaulish town; capital of Austrasia, eastern Frankish kingdom; capital of Lorraine later; free imperial town from 13th century; fell to French 1552, and ceded to them by Treaty of Westphalia (1648); restored to Germany 1871.

MILAN, chief town of Lombardy, in Italy; anciently called *Mediolanum* (whence modern name), it was finally subdued by Rome 196 B.C.; was seat of Western Emperors in 4th century; destroyed by Goths 539; occupied by Lombards 569; under Franks 774; destroyed by Frederick Barbarossa 1162; came under House of Visconti 1262; republic 1447-50; Francesco Sforza became Duke 1450; occupied by French 1500-12; under Spanish crown 1535-1714; then under Austria till Napoleon's conquest 1796; annexed to kingdom of Italy 1859.

MONTENEGRO, kingdom in Balkan peninsula, continuously independent of Turkey ever since Turks overthrew Servia at Kossovo (1389); proclaimed itself a kingdom instead of a principality 1910.

MOSCOW, second capital of Russia; from the principality here the Russian state was gradually built up by conquest, &c.; Ivan III (1462-1505) chiefly established its supremacy; Peter the Great left it 1703 and founded St. Petersburg as new capital; occupied by French 1812 and ruined by accidental fire.

MUNICH, capital of kingdom of Bavaria; made capital of duchy of Bavaria 1255; occupied by Gustavus Adolphus 1632; in Austrian hands 1705 and 1742.

NANTES, city of western France; named from ancient Gaulish tribe Namnetes; was chief town of Britanny; Edict of Nantes (1598) gave toleration to Huguenots till its revocation in 1685.

NAPLES, largest city of Italy; originally a Greek settlement (*Neapolis* = "new town"); occupied by Rome in 4th century B.C.; taken from Goths by Belisarius in 6th century; taken back by Totila, but recovered for Eastern Empire by Narses; a duchy under exarchate of Ravenna; independent republic from beginning of 8th century; capital of Norman kingdom of Naples (or more correctly, Sicily on the mainland) from 12th century, sometimes along with insular Sicily as kingdom of Two Sicilies, sometimes apart from it; taken by Garibaldi 1860 and annexed to kingdom of Italy.

NAVARRA, province of northern Spain, representing former kingdom which included part of modern France; Spanish part finally annexed by Spanish kingdom 1516; French part continued as an independent kingdom till union with crown of France under Henry IV (Henry of Navarre).

NICE, town of southern France; founded 2000 years ago from Marseilles; came under

Saracens in 9th century; under protection of Savoy from 1388; taken and pillaged by Barbary pirates under Barbarossa 1543; several times taken by France, but always restored to Savoy; belonged to France 1792-1814; reverted to Sardinian kingdom 1814, but ceded to France 1860.

NORMANDY, old province of northern France, named from the Normans (= Northmen) who were granted it for settlement 911 by Charles the Simple; became a powerful duchy; its famous duke William the Conqueror became King of England 1066; conquered by French king from England 1204; taken back by England 1415-9; recovered by France 1450.

NORWAY, one of the Scandinavian kingdoms; established as a kingdom in 10th century; united with Denmark and Sweden by Union of Calmar 1397; united with Denmark only from 1450; ceded to Sweden 1814; became independent kingdom 1905.

NOVGOROD, town of Russia; called in Varangians or Swedes 862 to its defence, an event regarded as the foundation of the Russian state; long a great trading centre and independent state; conquered by Moscow 1478.

ORLEANS, city of France; named *Aurelianum* after Emperor Marcus Aurelius or Emperor Aurelian; taken by Franks 498; important throughout French history; relieved by Joan of Arc 1429; a Protestant centre in Wars of Religion.

PADUA, town of north-east Italy; claims to be oldest city in north Italy; after fall of Western Empire passed successively under Goths, Eastern Empire, Lombards, and Franks; under despots of Carrara family 1318-1405; under Venice 1405-1797; under Austria 1797-1866; included in kingdom of Italy since 1866.

PARIS, capital of France; named from Gaulish tribe Parisii; capital of French kingdom from 987.

PAVIA, city of Lombardy, in Italy; known as *Ticinum* in Roman times; became Lombard capital 570 and remained so till overthrow of Lombard power by Charlemagne 774; Francis I of France defeated and made prisoner here 1525 by Imperialists; under Napoleon 1796-1814; joined to Sardinian kingdom 1859.

PICARDY, district of north-east France, about Amiens, Boulogne, &c.; includes Soissons and Laon, two of chief capitals of Frankish kingdom; annexed to crown of France 1477.

PIEDMONT, province of north-west Italy, with Turin as capital; included in Lombard kingdom; came under dukes of Savoy, who are now represented by the King of Italy. See Savoy.

PISA, town of Italy, in Tuscany; of ancient origin; long a flourishing state, frequently at war with Genoa and Florence; overthrown by Genoa 1284; conquered by Florence 1406; finally subdued by Florence 1509.

POLAND, formerly a great European king-

Notes on Historical Geography

dom, now divided among Russia, Prussia, and Austria; kingdom dated from 10th century; united with Lithuania 1386; complete union with Lithuania 1569; first Partition 1772; second Partition 1793; third Partition 1796 ended the kingdom.

POMERANIA, province of Prussia; formerly Slavonic; occupied by Sweden during Thirty Years' War, and part assigned to Sweden by Treaty of Westphalia (1648); Swedish rule ceased 1815.

PORTUGAL, independent state of Iberian peninsula; county of Portugal established 1095; became kingdom 1248; became great colonial power in 15th century; ruled by Spanish King 1580–1640; republic established 1910.

PRAGUE, capital of Bohemian kingdom; an ancient city; Thirty Years' War began here 1618; occupied by Frederick the Great of Prussia 1744; occupied by Prussians again 1866. Treaty of Prague (1866) ended Austro-Prussian War.

PROVENCE, province of south-eastern France; name preserves the fact that Romans established their first province here after conquering the country; Aix was first capital, then Arles; fell under Visigothic rule in 5th century; passed to Ostrogoths, and then to Franks; part of middle kingdom under Lothair I at Verdun partition (843), but separated as a kingdom for his youngest son; kingdom of Arles or Provence (also called Cisjuram Burgundy) constituted 879; this passed to Empire 1032.

PRUSSIA, kingdom of German Empire; named from a former duchy, now province of East Prussia; title of King of Prussia assumed by Elector of Brandenburg 1701; dominant state in German Empire, with its King as Emperor, since 1871.

RAGUSA, port of Dalmatia, on east coast of Adriatic; of ancient origin; under Venice 1205–1358; under Hungary 1358–1526; then independent republic; taken by French 1805; annexed to Austria 1814.

RATISBON (German, Regensburg), town of Bavaria; former seat of Dukes of Bavaria; flourishing free city in Middle Ages; Diet of the Empire held here regularly after 1663.

RAVENNA, town of Italy, near east coast of Italy; of ancient origin; became naval station under Augustus; made capital of Western Empire by Honorius in 5th century; Odoacer made it his capital, and then Theodosius (493–526); annexed to Eastern Empire 539, and became capital of exarchate of Ravenna; taken by Lombards 752, and soon afterwards by Franks; came into papal hands; added to Italian kingdom 1859.

REIMS, city of north-eastern France; so named from the Gaulish tribe Remi; taken by Vandals and then by Huns; Frankish and French kings consecrated here; in hands of English 1420–29; occupied by Germans, 1914.

ROME, the most historic city of the world; founded according to tradition in 8th century

B.C.; seat of Roman kingdom, then of republic, then of Roman Empire, then of Western Empire; became seat of the Papacy; since 1870 capital of kingdom of Italy.

ST. PETERSBURG, now Petrograd, Russian capital, named from Peter the Great, who founded it 1703 on territory conquered from Swedes.

SALONICA, port of Macedonia, now belonging to Greece; anciently Thessalonica; founded 315 B.C.; Christianized by St. Paul; taken by Saracens 904; taken by Normans 1185; became Latin kingdom 1204, but conquered by despot of Epirus; taken by Turks 1430; passed to Greece 1913.

SARAGOSSA, town of Spain; founded as *Cesarea Augustu* (whence name) 25 B.C.; taken by Visigoths 476, and by Moors 712; Moors expelled by King of Aragon 1118, and city became capital of Aragon; famous for the sieges of 1808.

SARDINIA, Italian island in Mediterranean; taken by Rome from Carthaginians; occupied by Vandals, but recovered for Eastern Empire 534; taken by Goths under Totila, but recovered for Eastern Empire by Narses; attacked by Saracens from 8th century, and partially occupied; under Pisa from 11th century; Pisans driven out by Aragon 1326; remained Spanish till 1708, when it became Austrian; given to Duke of Savoy 1720 in exchange for Sicily, Duke of Savoy becoming henceforward King of Sardinia; thereafter followed fortunes of Savoy house.

SAVOY, district of France south of Lake Geneva; ancestral home of a duchy which dates back to the 11th century; acquired Piedmont and made Turin its capital; Duke became King of Sicily 1713, but obliged to exchange Sicily for Sardinia, becoming King of Sardinia 1720; this kingdom absorbed rest of Italy, becoming kingdom of Italy; ancestral territory of Savoy ceded to France 1866.

SAXONY, kingdom of German Empire; originally applied to country in north-western Germany, about Ems and Weser, inhabited by the tribe of Saxons; these were conquered by Charlemagne; duchy of Saxony lasted here till 1180, when it was broken up; name of Saxony disappeared from most of it, remaining attached only to Lauenburg and Wittenberg districts; Lauenburg absorbed by Hanover, and modern Saxony represents lands farther east that came to be associated with Wittenberg; Saxony became a kingdom 1806; greater part of it annexed by Prussia 1815; Saxony included in German Confederation 1815; supported Austria 1866; entered North German Confederation 1867; in German Empire from its foundation 1871.

SCHLESWIG, northern district of Prussia, formerly a duchy held as a fief of Danish crown; annexed by Prussia as a result of the wars of 1864–6.

SERVIA, kingdom of Balkan district; so named from Slavonic people inhabiting it, the Serbs; powerful kingdom under Stephen

Dushan in 14th century; conquered by Turks at battle of Kossovo (1389); regained autonomy 1830, and became completely independent by Treaty of Berlin (1878); gained great successes in war against Turkey 1912-3, and obtained large part of Macedonia.

SEVILLE, city of southern Spain, chief town of Andalusia; capital of Roman province Baetica; taken by Vandals in 5th century, by Visigoths 531, and by Moors 712; recovered for Christendom 1248.

SICILY, island of Mediterranean, included in kingdom of Italy; occupied by Phoenicians, then by Greeks; battleground between Romans and Carthaginians; became a Roman province; occupied by Vandals in 5th century, then came under Gothic rule; recovered for Eastern Empire 535; Saracen conquest completed 965; Norman conquest began 1066; kingdom established 1105; Sicilian Vespers of 1282 separated Sicily from associated continental lands in south Italy, and placed it under Aragon; conquered by Garibaldi for kingdom of Italy.

SPAIN, kingdom of Iberian peninsula; name comes from ancient Latin name of Hispania; formed by gradual union of Christian states of the peninsula (except Portugal) and reconquest from Moors, completed 1492.

STRASBURG, town of Germany, capital of Alsace - Lorraine; Emperor Julian defeated Alamanni here 357; under Franks from 5th century; associated with German kingdom and Empire; seized by Louis XIV 1681, and secured to him by Peace of Ryswyk (1697); annexed to German Empire 1871.

SWEDEN, Scandinavian kingdom; joined with Norway and Denmark by Union of Calmar (1397); separated under its own king 1523; champion of Protestantism in Europe under Gustavus Adolphus in Thirty Years' War; lost Finland to Russia 1809; union with Norway 1814; separation of Norway 1905.

SWITZERLAND, federal republic of central Europe; history begins with League of Uri, Schwyz (hence name), and Unterwalden in 1291; virtually recognized as independent of the Empire 1499; complete independence secured by Treaty of Westphalia (1648); Helvetic Republic set up by France 1798; Confederation created by Napoleon's Act of Mediation (1803); present constitution established 1874.

TANGIER, part of Morocco, called *Tingis* by Romans; successively occupied by Vandals, Eastern Empire, and Moors; taken by Portugal 1471, fell to Spain 1580, recovered by Portugal 1656; came to England 1662 as marriage dower of Charles II's queen; abandoned to Moors 1684.

TOLEDO, city of Spain; taken by Romans 193 B.C.; became Visigothic capital; taken by Moors 712; taken by Castile 1085 and made its capital; capital of Spain till 1560.

TOULOUSE, city of southern France; of ancient foundation, became capital of Visigoths 419; conquered by Franks 507; later became

seat of a powerful countship; countship merged in French crown 1271; Wellington defeated Soult here 1814.

TRENT, a town of southern Tyrol, so named from the Tridentini, whose capital it was; successively under Romans, Ostrogoths, Lombards, and Franks; attached to Germany 1027 under its bishop as ruler; passed to Austria 1803. Council of Trent (1545-63) organized the Counter-Reformation.

TRIER (French, *Trèves*), town of Prussian Rhine province; anciently capital of the Treviri (whence name); important Roman town; long the capital from which Gaul, Britain, and Spain were ruled under Roman Empire; favourite residence of Constantine the Great; fell to Franks 455; became seat of an archbishop in 9th century, and archbishop became later an elector of the empire; annexed by France 1801, but returned to Germany 1814.

TURIN, chief town of Piedmont, in Italy; so named from Gaulish tribe Taurini, whose capital it was; capital of kingdom of Sardinia down till 1860, then of kingdom of Italy 1860-5.

TUSCANY, division of Italy, with Florence as chief town; formerly a marquisate, but this ended with Matilda, who bequeathed her estates to the Pope 1114; grand-duchy created 1567; Napoleon created a kingdom of Etruria 1801; returned to Austrians 1814; annexed to kingdom of Sardinia 1860.

VENICE, city of Italy; said to have been founded in 452 by refugees from Aquileia when it was sacked by the Huns; first doge elected 697; Franks under Pepin failed to subdue it, and it continued a dependency of Eastern Empire; trade benefited by Crusades; gained much territory by the Latin conquest of Constantinople (1204); great commercial struggle with Genoa ended with the final victory of Venice 1380; began land conquest in 15th century; wars with Turks began 1464; commercial greatness undermined by discovery of Cape route to India; League of Cambrai (1508) against her; possessions gradually lost to Turks; annexed to Austria by Peace of Campo Formio (1797); incorporated in Italy 1866. District of Venetia was so named from tribe of Veneti before the town was founded.

VIENNA, capital of Austrian Empire; called *Vindobona* by Romans; conquered by Avars; taken by Charlemagne; became capital of duchy of Austria 1156; capital of Hapsburgs from 1276; taken by Matthias Corvinus of Hungary 1485; unsuccessfully besieged by Turks 1529 and 1683; occupied by Napoleon 1805 and 1809. Congress of Vienna (1814-5) settled affairs of Europe after fall of Napoleon.

WARSAW, from 1550 capital of the Polish kingdom; taken by Sweden 1655 and 1702; taken by Russia 1764 and 1794; occupied by Napoleon 1806, and made capital of independent duchy of Warsaw; taken by Austrians 1809, and by Russians 1813; in revolt against

Notes on Historical Geography

Russia 1830, but subdued 1831; insurrection failed 1863.

WESTPHALIA, province of Prussia, in north-west; originally a duchy, which developed out of ancient duchy of Saxony; gradually encroached on by Brandenburg (later, kingdom of Prussia); kingdom of Westphalia created by Napoleon 1807, but overthrown 1813; annexed to Prussia 1815; the kingdom was more extensive than the modern province.

WORMS, town of Germany, in grand-duchy of Hesse; was capital of Burgundian kingdom in 5th century; destroyed by Huns 436; came under Franks; frequent seat of Diet of the

Empire; Luther appeared before a diet here 1521; burned by French 1689; taken by French 1792, and annexed 1801; came to Hesse 1815. Concordat of Worms (1122) ended investiture controversy.

WÜRTTEMBERG, kingdom of Germany, in south-west; conquered by Romans in 1st century; conquered by Alamanni, then by Franks in 496; came under German duchy of Swabia in 9th century; a count of Württemberg arose in 13th century; became duchy 1495; duke assumed title of king 1806, and helped Napoleon; fought on side of Austria 1866; in German Empire from foundation 1871.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. GENERAL HISTORY

RANKE—*Weltgeschichte* (9 vols., Leipzig),
History of the Popes.

LAVISSE ET RAMBAUD—*Histoire Générale du Quatrième Siècle à nos Jours* (12 vols., Paris).

GIBBON—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (ed. Bury, 7 vols.), The Student's Gibbon (2 vols.).

WEBER—*Allgemeine Weltgeschichte* (15 vols., Leipzig).

HODGKIN—*Italy and Her Invaders*.

FREEMAN—*General Sketch of European History*.

THATCHER AND SCHWILL.—*A General History of Europe* (350–1900).

ONCKEN.—*Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen* (a monumental work; Berlin).

DÖLLINGER—*Studies in European History*.
The Cambridge Mediæval History, in course of publication. Planned by J. B. BURY.
The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by LORD ACTON.

Historical Articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (latest edition, Cambridge University Press).

For special periods and biographies the following series contain many useful volumes:—

“The Heroes of the Nations.”
“Story of the Nations.”
“English Statesmen.”
“English Men of Action.”
“Foreign Statesmen.”
“Periods of European History.” Edited by ARTHUR HASSALL.

B. ANCIENT HISTORY

I. Greece.

(1) *Works in several volumes.*

GROTE—*History of Greece*.

GILLIES—*History of Ancient Greece*.

MITFORD—*History of Greece*.

HOLM—*History of Greece*.

FRAZER—Translation of Pausanias's Description of Greece.

CURTIUS—*History of Greece*.

LLOYD—*The Age of Pericles*.

ABBOTT—*History of Greece*.

BURY—*History of Greece*.

FREEMAN—*Ancient Greece*.

PHILLIPSON—*International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*.

(2) *Shorter works.*

OMAN—*History of Greece* (to 323 B.C.).

SHUCKBURGH—*History of Greece*.

GARDNER—*Ancient Athens*.

ZIMMERN—*The Greek Commonwealth*.

HARRISON—*Primitive Athens*.

GRANT—*Greece in the Age of Pericles*.

BUTCHER—*What we owe to Greece*.

DICKINSON—*The Greek View of Life*.

GREENIDGE—*Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*.

MAHAFFY—*The Silver Age of the Greek World*, *The Greek World under Roman Sway*, *Greek Life and Thought*, *Alexander's Empire*.

FREEMAN—*Alexander the Great*.

HOGARTH—*Philip and Alexander of Macedon*.

II. Rome.

(1) *Works in several volumes.*

MOMMSEN—*History of Rome*, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*.

NIEBUHR—*Roman History*, *Lectures on the History of Rome*, *Lectures on Ancient History*.

LIDDELL—*History of Rome*,

LONG—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Republic*.

MERIVALE—*History of the Romans under the Empire*.

FERRERO—*Greatness and Decline of Rome*.

Bibliography

- GREENIDGE—History of Rome (133 B.C. to A.D. 70).
- HEITLAND—The Roman Republic.
- (2) *Shorter works.*
- MERIVALE—The Fall of the Roman Republic, The Romans under the Empire.
- OMAN—Seven Roman Statesmen (the Gracchi, Sulla, Crassus, Cato, Pompey, Caesar).
- BURY—History of the Roman Empire.
- FREEMAN—The Flavian Cæsars.
- THOMAS ARNOLD—History of the later Roman Commonwealth, History of Rome.
- W. T. ARNOLD—Studies in Roman Im-
- perialism, Roman Provincial Administration.
- FOWLER—Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero, The City-State of the Greeks and Romans.
- KINGSLEY—The Roman and the Tenton.
- SHUCKBURGH—Augustus.
- FROUDE—Cæsar.
- PELHAM—Roman History.
- ABBOTT—The Common People of Ancient Rome.
- DILL—Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, Roman Society in the Last Century of the Empire.
- BEESLEY—The Gracchi, Marius, and Sulla.
- SMITH—Carthage and the Carthaginians.

C. MEDIÆVAL HISTORY

I. General Works.

- Those already quoted as General History, so far as they apply to Mediæval History.
- PFLUGTE—Hartung and Prutz—Geschichte des Mittelalters (Berlin).
- ASSMANN—Geschichte des Mittelalters (Brunswick).
- EMERTON—An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages (Boston), Mediæval Europe (Boston).
- THATCHER AND SCHWILL—Europe in the Middle Ages.
- HALLAM—View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages.
- BRYCE—The Holy Roman Empire.
- GUIZOT—Histoire de la Civilisation en Europe depuis la chute de l'Empire Romain (translated), Histoire des Origines du Gouvernement représentatif en Europe.
- CUNNINGHAM—An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects.
- OMAN—A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages.
- FREEMAN—Historical Geography of Europe.
- ADAMS—Civilization during the Middle Ages.
- LEA—History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages.
- FROISSART—Chroniques (selection translated in "Globe" Series).

II. Ecclesiastical History.

- MILMAN—History of Latin Christianity.
- NEANDER—General History of the Christian Religion and Church.
- MONTALEMBERT—The Monks of the West, from St. Benedict to St. Bernard.
- GISELEIER—Text-Book of Church History.

MÖLLE—Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Freiburg).

HORE—Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church.

FISHER—Beginnings of Christianity.

STEPHENS—Hildebrand and His Times.

HARDWICK—History of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages.

III. Works relating to Various Countries, or Aspects of History.

(1) *The Franks.*

CHURCH—The Beginnings of the Middle Ages.

DAVIS—Charlemagne.

MULLINGER—The Schools of Charles the Great.

MOMBERT—Charles the Great.

WEST—Alcuin.

WELLS—The Age of Charlemagne.

(2) *France.*

KITCHIN—History of France.

JOHNSON—The Normans in Europe.

BÉMOND ET MONOD—Histoire de l'Europe et en particulier de la France.

RAMEAUD—Histoire de la Civilisation en France.

JOINVILLE—La Vie de Saint Louis.

LOWELL—Joan of Arc.

LAMARTINE—Jeanne d'Arc.

HUTTON—Philip Augustus ("Foreign Statesmen" Series).

WILLERT—Louis XI.

LUCHAIRE—Les Communes & Institutions Monarchiques de la France sous les Premiers C

LAVISSE—Histoire de France.

MICHELET—Histoire de France.

—History of Charles the Bold.

(3) *Germany and the Empire.*

- MENZEL—History of Germany.
 FISHER—Mediaeval Empire.
 HENDERSON—History of Germany during the Middle Ages.
 TESTA—War of Frederick I against the Communes of Lombardy.
 ZELLER—*Histoire d'Allemagne.*
 GIESEBRECHT—Geschichte der Deutschen Kaiserzeit.
 KINGTON—History of Frederick II.
 NITZCH—Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes.

(4) *Italy.*

- ZELLER—*Histoire d'Italie.*
 DANTE—*De Monarchia* (trans. Church).
 DUFFY—The Tuscan Republics.
 SYMONDS—The Renaissance in Italy, Life and Times of Michaelangelo.
 SISMONDI—History of the Italian Republics.
 EWART—Cosimo de Medici.
 ARMSTRONG—Lorenzo de Medici.
 BROWNING—Guelphs and Ghibellines, The Age of the Condottieri.
 MRS. OLIPHANT—Makers of Florence, Makers of Venice.
 MACHIAVELLI—History of Florence.
 VILLARI—Life and Times of Savonarola, Life and Times of Machiavelli.
 MORLEY—Machiavelli.
 GREGORIOVIUS—Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter.
 DELARE—Les Normands en Italie. See also GIBBON, Ch. LVI.
 NAPIER—Florentine History.

(5) *The Monastic Movement.*

- ECKENSTEIN—Woman under Monasticism.
 HARNACK—Monasticism—its Ideals and its History.
 JESSOPP—The Coming of the Friars.
 KINGSLEY—Hermits.
 LEA—History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.
 SABATIER—St. François d'Assise.
 MRS. OLIPHANT—St. Francis of Assisi.
 NEWMAN—Lives of the English Saints.
 CHURCH—Life of St. Anselm.
 MORISON—Life of St. Bernard.
 HAURÉAU—*De la Philosophie Scholastique.*

(6) *Mohammedanism and the Crusades.*

- MUIR—Life of Mahomet, The Caliphate.
 YULE—Marco Polo.

GILMAN—The Saracens.

ARCHER AND KINGSFORD—The Crusades ("Story of the Nations" Series).

MOMBERT—Short History of the Crusades.

CONDÉ—Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.

PEARS—Fall of Constantinople (Fourth Crusade).

KUGLER—Geschichte der Kreuzzüge.

SYBEL—History and Literature of the Crusades.

RÖHRICH—Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem.

GIBBON—Ch. LVIII and LIX.

(7) *The Hanseatic League and the Towns.*

ZIMMERN—The Hansa.

SARTORIUS—Geschichte des Ursprunges der Deutschen Hanse.

LUCHAIRE—Les Communes Françaises.

GROSS—The Gild Merchant.

CUNNINGHAM—Growth of English Industry and Commerce.

ASHLEY—English Economic History.

(8) *The Netherlands, Switzerland, and the Peninsula.*

BLOK—History of the People of the Netherlands.

ASHLEY—James and Philip van Artevelde.

HUGANDSTEAD—Switzerland.

DAENDLICKER—Short History of Switzerland.

BUCHEIM—Wilhelm Tell.

PRESSCOTT—Ferdinand and Isabella.

BURKE—History of Spain.

STEPHENS—Portugal ("Story of the Nations" Series).

WATTS—Spain ("Story of the Nations" Series").

LANE-POOLE—The Moors in Spain ("Story of the Nations" Series).

CLARKE—The Cid ("Heroes of the Nations" Series).

HALE—Spain.

WASHINGTON IRVING—Chronicles of the Conquest of Granada.

(9) *The Eastern Empire.*

FINLAY—History of Greece.

GIBBON—Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

SCHLUMBERGER—Un Empereur byzantin au X^e siècle, Nicéphore Phocas, L'Epopee byzantin à la fin du X^e siècle.

LA JONQUIÈRE—Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman.

Bibliography

D. MODERN HISTORY

I. General Works.

Those already quoted on General History, so far as they apply to Modern History.

LODGE—History of Modern Europe.
DYER AND HASSALL—History of Modern Europe.
MACAULAY—Essays.
TREITSCHKE—Deutsche Geschichte.

II. Works relating to Various Countries, or Aspects of History.

(1) *The Reformation Period.*

CREIGHTON—History of the Papacy during the Reformation.
RANKE—History of the Reformation in Germany.
FISHER—History of the Reformation.
POWERS—England and the Reformation.
FROUDE—History of England (Fall of Wolsey to Death of Elizabeth).
SEEBOHM—The Oxford Reformers.
ARMSTRONG—Charles V.
EMERTON—Erasmus.
FROUDE—Life and Letters of Erasmus.
KÖSTLIN—Life of Luther.
JACOBS—Martin Luther.
RICHARD—Melanchthon.
WARD—The Counter-Reformation.
HUME—Philip II ("Foreign Statesmen" Series).

STUBBS—Lectures on European History.
MOTLEY—Rise of the Dutch Republic, History of the United Netherlands, John of Barneveld.
PUTNAM—William the Silent.
HARRISON—William the Silent ("Foreign Statesmen" Series).
ARMSTRONG—French Wars of Religion.
WILLERT—Henry of Navarre ("Heroes of the Nations" Series).
LODGE—Richelieu ("Foreign Statesmen" Series).
PERKINS—France under Richelieu and Mazarin, Richelieu ("Heroes of the Nations" Series).
GARDINER—The Thirty Years' War.
FLETCHER—Gustavus Adolphus ("Heroes of the Nations" Series).

(2) *Colonization.*

SEELEY—Growth of British Policy, The Expansion of England.
INNES—Britain and Her Rivals (1713-1789).
JENKS—The Australasian Colonies.
MAHAN—Influence of Sea Power upon History.
LYALL—British Dominion in India.

CHANNING—The United States of America (1763-1865).

JOHNSTON—A History of the Colonization of Africa by Asiatic and European Nations.

WILSON—Clive.

LYALL—Hastings.

LECKY—England in the Eighteenth Century.

PARKIN—Imperial Federation.

DILKE—Problems of Greater Britain.

PARKMAN—Pioneers of France in the New World, Montcalm and Wolfe.

CASTONNET DES FOSSES—L'Inde française avant Dupleix.

MALLESON—History of the French in India.

BRYCE—Impressions in South Africa.

(3) *France (before).*

HASSALL—Louis XIV ("Heroes of the Nations" Series).

ADAMS—Growth of the French Nation.

VOLTAIRE—Le Siècle de Louis XIV.

GRANT—The History of the French Monarchy.

CHERUEL—Le Ministère de Mazarin.

ROUSSET—Histoire de Louvois.

PARNELL—The War of the Spanish Succession.

DE TOCQUEVILLE—L'Ancien Régime, Histoire Philosophique du Règne de Louis XV.

JOBEZ—La France sous Louis XV.

PERKINS—France under Louis XV.

(4) *France (Revolutionary Era).*

ROSE—Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era.

STEPHENS—The French Revolution.

CARLYLE—The French Revolution.

SYBEL—The French Revolution.

TAINE—The Ancient Régime, The French Revolution, The Modern

ROSE—Life of Napoleon.

MIGNET—The French Revolution.

MORLEY—Miscellanies, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot.

WILLERT—Mirabeau.

SOREL—L'Europe et la Révolution Française.

MAHAN—The Influence of Sea Power on the French Revolution and the Empire.

ROSEBERRY—Pitt, Napoleon—the Last Phase.

NAPIER—History of the Peninsular War.

SHAND—The War in the Peninsula.

SEELEY—Life of Heine.

HOUSSAYE—1814 and 1815.

FYFFE—Modern Europe.

(5) *Austria, Prussia, and Germany.*

- TUTTLE—History of Prussia.
 CARLYLE—Frederick the Great.
 LONGMAN—Frederick the Great.
 REDDAWAY—Frederick the Great (“Heroes of the Nations” Series).
 LAVISSE—La Jeunesse du Grand Frédéric.
 BEER—Zur Geschichte der Politik Karls VI.
 BRIGHT—Maria Theresa (“Foreign Statesmen” Series).
 COX—History of the House of Austria.
 BRIGHT—Joseph II (“Foreign Statesmen” Series).
 RANKE—Der Ursprung des Siebenjährigen Krieges.

(6) *Russia, Denmark, Sweden, and Poland.*

- RAMBAUD—History of Russia.
 MORFILL—History of Russia.
 WALISZEWSKI—Peter the Great.
 BAIN—Charles XII, The Successors of Peter the Great, Gustavus III and his Contemporaries, the Pupils of Peter the Great.
 DAY—The Russian Government in Poland.
 KAREEF—Les Causes de la Chute de la Pologne.
 SKRINE—Expansion of Russia, 1815-1900.
 KLUCHEVSKY—History of Russia.
 MAVOR—Economic History of Russia.

(7) *The Eastern Question.*

- DRIAULT—La Question d’Orient.
 CREASY—History of the Ottoman Turks.
 FINLAY—History of the Greek Revolution.
 PHILLIPS—The War of Greek Independence.
 DE POUQUEVILLE—La Régénération de la Grèce.
 KINGLAKE—The Invasion of the Crimea.
 HOLLAND—The European Contest in the Eastern Question.
 SERGEAUNT—Greece in the Nineteenth Century.
 MILLAR—The Ottoman Empire, 1801-93
 SOREL—La Question d’Orient au XVIII^e Siècle.
 RANKIN—Inner History of the Balkan War.

(8) *The Nineteenth Century.*(a) *General.*

- FYFFE—History of Modern Europe (1792-1878).
 MÜLLER—History of Recent Times.
 STERN—Geschichte Europas (1815-1871).

SEIGNOBOS—Histoire politique de l’Europe contemporaine.

ANDREWS—The Historical Development of Modern Europe.

DE MARTENS—Recueil des Traités conclus par la Russie avec des États étrangers.

MAURICE—The Revolutionary Movements of 1848-1849 in Italy, Austria, and Hungary.

ALISON PHILLIPS—Modern Europe (from 1815).

ALISON PHILLIPS—Confederation of Europe (1813-1823).

ROSE—Development of the European Nations (1870-1900).

FULLERTON—Problems of Power.

HERTSLET—The Map of Europe by Treaty (1814-1891).

(b) *France.*

MARTIN—Histoire de France.

HAURANNE—Histoire des Institutions parlementaires en France.

CROWE—Louis XVIII and Charles X.

THUREAU-DANGIN—Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet.

OULLIVIER—L’Empire libéral.

DE LA GORCE—Histoire du Second Empire.

HEADLAM—France.

(c) *Germany.*

SYBEL—Die Begründung des Deutschen Reichs.

JANSEN AND SAMWER—Schleswig-Holsteins Befreiung.

SOREL—Histoire diplomatique de la Guerre Franco-Allemande.

MAURICE—The Franco-German War.

HEADLAM—Bismarck (“Heroes of the Nations” Series); The Foundation of the German Empire.

LOWE—Prince Bismarck..

(d) *Austria-Hungary.*

SPRINGE—Geschichte Oesterreichs.

DEMELITSCH—Fürst Metternich und seine Auswärtige Politik.

HARTIG—Genesis of the Revolution of 1848 in Austria.

(e) *Italy.*

KING—History of Italian Unity.

STILLMAN—The Union of Italy.

BIANCHI—Storia documentata della diplomazia Europea in Italia.

THAYER—Dawn of Italian Independence.

CESARESCO—The Liberation of Italy, Cavour.

(g) *The United States and America.*

BANCROFT—History of America.

PALFREY—History of New England.

Bibliography

- HILDRETH—History of the United States.
- WINSOR—Narrative and Critical History of America.
- RHODES—History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850.
- PREScott—Conquest of Mexico, Conquest of Peru.
- (10) *The Great European War.*
- BERNHARDI—Germany and the Next War.
- CRAMB—Germany and England.
- BODLEY—France.
- SABATIER—France of To-day.
- WALLACE—Russia.
- STEED—The Hapsburg Monarchy.
- DRAGE—Austria-Hungary.
- BOULGER—History of Belgium.
- RENWICK—Luxemburg: The Grand Duchy and its People.
- VON BÜLOW—Imperial Germany.
- DAWSON—Evolution of Modern Germany.
- MOYSET—L'Esprit public en Allemagne.
- KELLNER, ETC.—Austria of the Austrians, and Hungary of the Hungarians.
- USHER—Pan-Germanism.
- PERRIS—Germany and the German Emperor.
- STEAD—Servia and the Servians.
- MIJATOVICH—Servia of the Servians.
- GRIBLE—Life of Emperor Francis Joseph.
- ALEXINSKY—Modern Russia.
- FORTESCUE—History of the British Army.
- JAMES—Modern Strategy.
- MAHAN—Naval Strategy.
- FYFFE—Submarine Warfare.
- BETHELL—Modern Artillery in the Field.
- HENDERSON—Science of War.
- ASTON—Sea, Land, and Air Strategy.
- JOHNSTONE—Principles of Modern Strategy.
- SPAIGHT—Aircraft in War.
- HALL—Laws of Naval Warfare.
- SPAIGHT—War Rights on Land.
- ALTHAM—Principles of War.
- HAMLEY—Operations of War.
- HORSETZKY—The Chief Campaigns of Europe since 1792.
- BERNHARDI—On War of To-day.
- CORBETT—Some Principles of Maritime Strategy.
- ANGELL—The Great Illusion.
- ANGELL—The Foundations of International Polity.

SOME HISTORICAL TALES AND ROMANCES

VOLUME I (TO A.D. 630)

Greek Romances of Heliodorus, Longus, and Achilles Tatius, especially *The Adventures of Theagenes and Chariclea*. Translated by Rev. R. Smith, M.A. (Bohn's Library).

G. A. HENTY.

For the Temple (*Fall of Jerusalem*).
The Young Carthaginian (*Times of Hannibal*).
Beric the Briton (*Roman Invasion of Britain*).
The Cat of Bubastes (*Ancient Egypt*).

CHARLES KINGSLEY.

Hypatia (*Fifth Century, Egypt*).

ANONYMOUS.

Letters from Palmyra (*Early Rome*).

REV. A. J. CHURCH.

Two Thousand Years Ago (*A Roman Boy*).
Lords of the World (*Carthage and Corinth*).
Last Days of Jerusalem.
Stories from Livy.
Stories from Virgil.
The Burning of Rome.
Helmet and Spear (*Wars of Greeks and Romans*).

RUDYARD KIPLING.

Puck of Pook's Hill (*Britain in Roman Times*).

SIR H. MAXWELL.

A Duke of Britain (*Britain and Italy in Roman Times*).

G. J. WHYTE-MELVILLE.

The Gladiators (*Vitellius: Siege of Jerusalem*).

VOLUME II (630-1500)

SIR WALTER SCOTT.

Quentin Durward (*Louis XI*).
The Talisman (*Third Crusade, Twelfth Century*).
Anne of Geierstein (*Switzerland and Central Europe, Fifteenth Century*).
Count Robert of Paris (*Byzantine Empire*).
Ivanhoe (*Richard I: Saxon and Norman*).

BULWER LYTTON.

Rienzi (*Roman Tribune, 1313-54*).
Last of the Barons (*Warwick the Kingmaker*).
Harold (*Norman Conquest*).

CHARLES KINGSLEY.

Hereward the Wake (*Early English*).

FREDERIC HARRISON.

Theophano (*Tenth Century Crusades*).

G. A. HENTY.

The Dragon and the Raven (*King Alfred*).
In Freedom's Cause (*Wallace and Bruce*).

Knight of the White Cross (*Siege of Rhodes*).
The Lion of St. Mark (*Venice, Fourteenth Century*).
St. George for England (*Black Death: Crecy*).
Wulf the Saxon (*Norman Conquest*).
At Agincourt (*White Hoods of Paris*).
A March on London (*Wat Tyler*).

GEORGE ELIOT.

Romola (*Savonarola: Florence, Renaissance*).

CHARLES READE.

The Cloister and the Hearth (*Central Europe, End of Middle Ages*).

S. BARING-GOULD.

Grettir the Outlaw (*Iceland Sagas*).

DR. GORDON STABLES.

Westward with Columbus.

ROBERT LEIGHTON.

Olaf the Glorious (*Viking Age*).

C. W. WHISTLER.

A Thane of Wessex (*Viking Raids*).
King Olaf's Kinsman (*Saxons and Danes*).
Wulfric the Weapon Thane (*Saxons and Danes*).

JAMES GRANT.

The Yellow Frigate (*James III*).

REV. A. J. CHURCH.

The Crusaders (*Holy Sepulchre*).

Stories of Charlemagne.

The Count of the Saxon Shore (*Briton and Saxon*).

SIR A. CONAN DOYLE.

Sir Nigel (*John of Gaunt: Du Guesclin*).

The White Company (*Edward III: Wars in France*).

MAURICE HEWLETT.

The Queen's Quair (*Mary Stuart*).
Richard Yea and Nay (*Cœur de Lion*).

SIR H. MAXWELL.

The Chevalier of the Splendid Crest (*Edward II*).

G. A. LAWRENCE.

Brakespeare (*Edward III: Black Prince*).

J. G. EDGAR.

Crecy and Poictiers.

VOLUME III (1500-1788)

SIR W. SCOTT.

Waverley (*Insurrection of '45*).

The Fortunes of Nigel (*James I of England, 1603*).

Kenilworth (*Queen Elizabeth*).

The Monastery and The Abbot (*Queen Mary: the Reformation*).

Woodstock (*Cromwell: Charles II in hiding*).

CHARLES KINGSLEY.

Westward Ho! (*Spanish Main*).

R. L. STEVENSON.

The Black Arrow (*Wars of Roses: Richard III*).

HARRISON AINSWORTH.

Old St. Paul's (*London Plague and Fire*).

The Tower of London (*Lady Jane Grey: Old London*).

Guy Fawkes (*Gunpowder Plot*).

CHARLES LEVER.

Charles O'Malley, the Irish Dragoon (*Peninsular War*).

Jack Hinton (*Peninsular War*).

Tom Burke of "Ours" (*Peninsular War*).

G. A. HENTY.

When London Burned (1665-6, *Dutch Wars*).

By England's Aid (*Freeing of the Netherlands*).

By Pike and Dyke (*Dutch Republic*).

Heid Fast for England (*Siege of Gibraltar*).

Orange and Green (*Boyne and Limerick*).

Under Drake's Flag (*Spanish Main*).

St. Bartholomew's Eve (*The Huguenots*).

The Lion of the North (*Gustavus Adolphus*).

In the Irish Brigade (*War in Flanders and Spain*).

The Bravest of the Brave (*Peterborough in Spain*).

At Aboukir and Acre (*The French in Egypt*).

Bonnie Prince Charlie (*Fontenoy and Culloden*).

By Conduct and Courage (*Days of Nelson*).

A Jacobite Exile (*Charles XII of Sweden*).

Under Wellington's Command (*Peninsular War*).

With Cochrane the Dauntless (*South American Waters*).

True to the Old Flag (*American Independence*).

No Surrender (*Za Vendée*).

Won by the Sword (*Thirty Years' War*).

With Frederick the Great (*Seven Years' War*).

With Wolfe in Canada (*Fall of Quebec*).

With Moore at Corunna (*Peninsular War*).

Through Russian Snows (*Retreat from Moscow*).

A Roving Commission (*Hayti Insurrection*).

By Right of Conquest (*Cortez in Mexico*).

The Treasure of the Incas (*Peru*).

R. LEIGHTON.

The Golden Galleon (*The Revenge: Queen Elizabeth*).

HARRY COLLINGWOOD.

Two Gallant Sons of Devon (*Days of Queen Bess*).

Across the Spanish Main (*Queen Bess*).

Under the Meteor Flag (*French Revolutionary War*).

CAPTAIN BRERETON.

In the King's Service (*Cromwell in Ireland*).

A Knight of St. John (*Siege of Malta*).

With Wellington in Spain (*Peninsular War*).

How Canada was Won (*Wolfe and Quebec*).

Roger the Bold (*Conquest of Mexico*).

G. J. WHYTE-MELVILLE.

The Queen's Maries (*Darnley: Elisabeth: John Knox*).

Holmby House (*Charles I*).

JAMES GRANT.

The Romance or War (*Peninsular War*).

STANLEY WEYMAN.

House of the Wolf (*St. Bartholomew*).

A Gentleman of France (*Huguenots*).

Rôle (*Richelieu*).

Some Historical Tales and Romances

SIR A. T. QUILLER COUCH.

The Blue Pavilions (*Louis XIV: Marlborough: St. Germains*).

JUDGE E. A. PARRY.

England's Elizabeth (*Mary: Earl of Leicester*).

HERBERT STRANG.

Harry Rochester (*Marlborough and Eugene*).
Boys of the Light Brigade (*Spain and Peninsula*).

H. S. MERRIMAN.

Barlasch of the Guard (*Napoleon: Russia*).

F. MADOX HUEFFER.

The Fifth Queen (*Henry VIII: Princess Mary: Bishop Gardiner*).
Privy Seal (*Henry VIII, Cromwell, &c.*).

The Half Moon (*James I, Henry Hudson, &c.*).

DAVID KER.

Under the Flag of France (*Du Guesclin*).

R. H. BENSON.

The King's Achievement (*Henry VIII: More: Cromwell*).

The Queen's Tragedy (*Mary Tudor: Latimer and Ridley: Calais*).

WM. BECK.

Hawkwood the Brave (*The White Company: Mediæval Italy*).

G. MANVILLE FENN.

The Golden Magnet (*Land of the Incas*).
In the King's Name (*Jacobite Times*).

E. PICKERING.

A Stout English Bowman (*Henry III*).
An Old-Time Yarn (*Mexico: Inquisition*).
Silas Verney (*Time, Charles II*).

J. S. FLETCHER.

In the Days of Drake.

SIR A. CONAN DOYLE.

Brigadier Gerard (*Wars of Napoleon*).
Micah Clarke (1685, *Western Rebellion*).
The Refugees (*Huguenots*).

SIR WALTER BESANT.

Gaspard de Coligny (*Huguenots*).

ANTHONY HOPE.

Simon Dale (*Restoration period*).

M. E. BRADDON.

In High Places (*Charles I: Masarin*).

A. E. W. MASON.

Clementina (*Princess Sobieski, Old Pretender, &c.*).

E. ROBINSON.

Whitefriars (*Charles II period*).

MARJORIE BOWEN.

The Viper of Milan (*Mid-Italian*).
I Will Maintain (*William of Orange*).
Defender of the Faith (*William and Mary: Sutherland: De Witt*).

R. BUCHANAN.

The Shadow of the Sword (*Brittany: Napoleon's Wars*).

CAPT. PERCY GROVES.

Reefer and Rifleman (*Peninsular Wars*).

C. M. YONGE.

The Armourer's Prentices (*Henry VIII: Wolsey: Erasmus*).

VOLUME IV (1789-PRESENT TIME)

CHARLES DICKENS.

A Tale of Two Cities (*Time, French Revolution*).

W. M. THACKERAY.

Henry Esmond (*Queen Anne: Old Pretender*).

G. A. HENTY.

In the Reign of Terror (*French Revolution*).
One of the 28th (*Waterloo*).
In Greek Waters (*Grecian Independence War*).
Out with Garibaldi (*Liberation of Italy*).
A Chapter of Adventures (*Bombardment of Alexandria*).
With the British Legion (*Carlist Wars*).
With the Allies to Pekin (*Relief of Legations*).
With Lee in Virginia (*American Civil War*).
Maori and Settler (*New Zealand War*).
The Young Colonists (*Zulu and Boer*).

With Kitchener in the Soudan (*Atbara and Omdurman*).

The Dash for Khartoum (*Nile Expedition*).
With Roberts to Pretoria (*South African War*).
By Sheer Pluck (*Ashanti War*).
With Buller in Natal (*South African War*).

CAPT. F. S. BRERETON.

Foes of the Red Cockade (*French Revolution*).
A Gallant Grenadier (*Crimean War*).
A Hero of Sedan (*Franco-Prussian War*).
With Wolseley to Kumasi (*Ashanti*).
Under the Spangled Banner (*Spanish-American War*).
With Rifle and Bayonet (*Boer War*). [War].
Kidnapped by Moors (*Morocco*).
With French at the Front (*European War, 1914*).

T. T. JEANS.

On Foreign Service (*Santa Cruz Revolution*).

Some Historical Tales and Romances

CAPT. MARRYAT.

Frank Mildmay (*Lord Cochrane*).
The King's Own (*French Wars: Mutiny of Nore*).
Midshipman Easy (*French Wars*).
Peter Simple (*French Wars*).

SIR WALTER BESANT.

St. Katherine's by the Tower (*French Revolution*).

SIR A. CONAN DOYLE.

The Great Shadow (*Napoleon: Waterloo*).

H. S. MERRIMAN.

In Kedar's Tents (*Carlist Spanish War*).

SIR A. T. QUILLER COUCH.

Sir John Constantine (*War of Liberation, Corsica*).

H. HAYENS.

Paris at Bay (*Commune*).

DR. GORDON STABLES.

For Life and Liberty (*Civil War, America*).

E. F. POLLARD.

With Gordon at Khartum.

INDIA

G. A. HENTY.

With Clive in India (*Plassey*).
The Tiger of Mysore (*Tippoo Saib*).
At the Point of the Bayonet (*Mahratta War Assaye*).
Through the Sikh War (*Punjab*).
On the Irrawaddy (*First Burmese War*).
Through Three Campaigns (*Chitral, Tirah*).

CAPTAIN BRERETON.

Jones of the 64th (*Assaye and Laswaree*).
A Hero of Lucknow (*Indian Mutiny*).

MICHAEL.

Tales of Indian Chivalry.

F. P. GIBBON.

The Disputed V.C. (*Indian Mutiny*).

MRS. STEELE.

On the Face of the Waters (*Indian Mutiny*).

RUDYARD KIPLING.

Plain Tales from the Hills, Soldiers Three, &c.

S. C. GRIER.

Like Another Helen (*Early Indian Empire*).

MEADOWS TAYLOR.

Tara (*Mahrattas, 1657*).

Ralph Darnell (*1757*).

Seeta (*1857*).

A Noble Queen (*The Dekkan: Siege of Ahmed-nugger*).

CHINA AND JAPAN

G. A. HENTY.

With the Allies to Pekin (*Relief of Legations*).

CAPTAIN BRERETON.

A Soldier of Japan (*Russo-Japanese War*).

The Dragon of Pekin (*Boxer Revolt*).

HERBERT STRANG.

Brown of Mukden (*Russo-Japanese War*).

Kobo (*Russo-Japanese War*).

G. A. HENTY.

To Herat and Cabul (*First Afghan War*).

For Name and Fame (*Roberts at Cabul*).

CAPTAIN BRERETON.

With Roberts to Candahar (*Third Afghan War*).

T. T. JEANS.

Mr. Midshipman Glover (*Chinese Pirates*).

Ford of H.M.S. *Vigilant* (*Chinese Pirates*).

SIR HARRY JOHNSTON.

Pioneers of Empire (*India, Tropical America, Australasia, West Africa, South Africa, Canada*).

